

CORNELL
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY



FROM

Cornell University Library
F 104N7 B62

Early history of the First church of Chr



3 1924 028 842 867

olin



Cornell University Library

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

THE EARLY HISTORY
OF THE
FIRST CHURCH OF CHRIST
NEW LONDON, CONN.

Jan 2 BY
REV. S. LEROY BLAKE, D. D.,
=
Pastor of the Church, from March 30, 1887.

PUBLISHED BY SUBSCRIPTION.

NEW LONDON :
PRESS OF THE DAY PUBLISHING COMPANY.

1897.

KC

44

F
104
N7B62

A7G0170

COPYRIGHT

BY S. LEROY BLAKE,

1897.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER.	PAGE.
I. INTRODUCTORY	1
II. PURITANISM IN CONNECTICUT	8
III. THE ORIGIN OF THE FIRST CHURCH OF CHRIST	31
IV. RICHARD BLINMAN'S PASTORATE	55
V. GERSHOM BULKELEY'S PASTORATE	91
VI. SIMON BRADSTREET'S PASTORATE	119
VII. MEMBERSHIP FROM 1642 TO 1683	154
VIII. THE HALF-WAY COVENANT	162
IX. THE ROGERENES	175
X. GURDON SALTONSTALL'S PASTORATE	191
XI. GOVERNOR SALTONSTALL	230
XII. THE DIACONATE	265
XIII. MEN WHO HAVE ENTERED THE MINISTRY FROM THE CHURCH	293

1.

INTRODUCTORY.

This Church has no record of its organization. Its origin, therefore, has been involved in uncertainty. Dr. Trumbull, the historian of Connecticut, supposed that it was constituted when its records began, October 5, 1670—the day of Mr. Bradstreet's ordination. But this date seemed altogether impossible. It was not like the men of those times to let twenty-five years pass in the history of a town with no Church. Besides, if the organization had taken place on that date, a record of the fact would have been made in the proceedings of the Colonial Legislature, which had voted that no Church should be embodied “without consent of the General Court, and approbation of the neighboring elders.” This fact, together with the fact that no record of any application to the General Court for permission to be embodied into a Church here can be found, led the writer to believe not only that the Church is older than the date of Mr. Bradstreet's ordination, but also that it is older than 1650—the date of Mr. Blinman's arrival in Pequot. Soon after assuming the pastorate he set about justi-

fying these convictions. The third chapter records the result.

If the Church had an earlier existence, then Mr. Bradstreet's list of members ought not to be the first. Proofs were soon found that a much earlier catalogue could be made out; proofs so positive as to leave no room whatever to doubt that there was a Church in New London long before October 5, 1670. The result appears in Chapter VII. It shows reasons to believe that there were Church members, whose names are known to us, twenty years before Mr. Bradstreet's list was made.

A Church without deacons would be a thing almost, if not quite, unknown among Congregational Churches. The writer found evidence that there were such officers early in the history of the Church in New London. Chapter X embodies the result of the search. It seemed best, while upon the topic, to complete the list and bring it down to date, although this is beyond the limit of the period covered by this volume. The same may be said of the list of men raised up for the ministry given in Chapter XI.

The name which this Church bears, The FIRST CHURCH OF CHRIST, was in the early days given to the first Church planted in a town. Thus the first Church in New Haven, in Hartford, in Middletown, in Fairfield, and in other ancient towns were origi-

nally called and are still known by this name. A vote passed June 19, 1700, is recorded on our ancient minutes, in which "The First Church of Christ" is, by its own official action, the name applied to this Church; is, in fact, the name it bore in Gloucester. Besides, for seventy-five years this was the only Church, of any name, on the ground; and therefore its right to be called the First Church of New London, and indeed of New London county, cannot be questioned.

A Church so ancient must have much in common with the history of the town which has grown up around it, and much in common with the world's progress during its life. From 1651 no Church, save those at Hartford and New Haven, was as closely connected with the civil and ecclesiastical history of Connecticut. Three of the Governors of the Colony were furnished from among its adherents—John Winthrop, Jr., Fitz-John Winthrop and Gurdon Saltonstall. Obadiah Bruen, a member of it, is named in the charter given by Charles II. Its pastor, Governor Saltonstall, had a conspicuous hand in framing the Saybrook Platform and was influential in the establishment of Yale College in its home in New Haven. Two of its pastors, Adams and McEwen, were members of the Board of Trustees of the College. Adams was offered the Presidency in 1714, which
1724,

office he declined at the urgent request of the town. Other similar facts show how close has been the touch of this Church with the events which have marked the world's progress during the last two hundred and fifty years.

So far as is known no other Church in Connecticut ever gave its pastor to be Governor of the State. It is also worth mention, as giving a hint of the stable character of the Church, that it has had but twelve ministers in two hundred and fifty-five years. It is believed that no other Church of equal age in the State, and few in the country, can show a like record. Two of its pastorates together covered almost a century. That of Eliphalet Adams extended from February 9, 1709, to October 4, 1753, when he died—a period of over forty-four and a half years. The pastorate of Dr. McEwen was the longest in the history of the Church, and extended from October 23, 1806, to September 7, 1860, when he died—a period of almost fifty-four years. The shortest ministry was three years, and was that of Mr. Bulkeley, who refused to be settled. The average length of pastorates, not counting Mr. Bulkeley, who was not ordained, has been over twenty-three years. It may be added that in not a single case has a pastor been dismissed, except in response to his own earnest desire.

The record of the Church, with reference to the branches of work and forms of activity which belong to the present, will appear in another volume. The great work of missions, the various branches of evangelism, the work in the slums of the great centers of population, movements like the Y. M. C. A., &c., were unknown to the seventeenth century. The aim of the present volume is to discover the origin of the Church, and trace the history of its beginnings to the time of Eliphalet Adams.

As the history of a Church is largely a story of its pastorates, we have written the narrative in this form. The biography of each minister is given only so far as his life was part of the life of the Church and gave significance to it. If the story seems somewhat identical with that of the town, it is because the town was the parish, and in some remote sense the Church, till 1726. However, this volume groups together the facts which belong distinctively to the life of the Church.

Special mention should be made here of Miss Caulkins' invaluable History of New London, as one of the principal and most reliable authorities consulted. The Colonial records of Connecticut and of Massachusetts have also been searched. The Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of Connecticut, as well as standard works on Congregationalism,

have furnished material. The records of the Church, although far from being full, have also aided in the preparation of this volume. These and other authorities are noted in the text, and indebtedness to them is hereby acknowledged.

The two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Church should have been held in May, 1892. But at that time the date of the organization was too problematical. This volume is sent forth in lieu of such a celebration. Certainly whoever are members of the Church in 1942, and whoever is pastor, they will not hesitate to celebrate its three hundredth anniversary in May of that year, and before the thirteenth day. Nor will there be any doubt about observing the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of its planting in New London in the early half of 1901.

This volume is also sent forth with the hope that its perusal may stimulate a new interest in this venerable Church on the part of those who now are members of it. They stand in the line of succession from eminent men and women, and compose a Church which has a history of which they may well be proud. Ancient as it is, it has the vigor of youth, and stands in line with the most advanced work of the Kingdom, yet without surrendering anything of that wholesome conservatism which refuses to remove the ancient landmarks.

With a prayer for continued divine blessing, this volume, dedicated to the worthy memory of the men and women who laid the foundations and reared the superstructure of our civil, social and religious freedom, is sent forth as a contribution to the ecclesiastical history of Connecticut.

II.

PURITANISM IN NEW LONDON.

Organizations and communities get, in their beginnings, that character which usually survives all changes, and remains to the end. The men who found a State, and lay the first courses in the rising wall; the men who begin a Church, lay its cornerstone, and erect it out of principles and beliefs which have been inwrought into the fibre of their being, give to each a permanent trend, which is not likely to change, without an irruption of opposing civil and religious forces, which sweep away the old landmarks. It is well therefore to look to find the roots of the State, of the social order, of the Church. Whatever else we may say, or think, we shall be obliged to admit that much of what we prize and enjoy today, is directly due to the men who laid the foundations.

It is quite the fashion now to speak slightingly of the so-called "blue laws of Connecticut," and of the Puritanism of the fathers. But it must not be for-

gotten that the Constitution drafted by Puritan Thomas Hooker in 1639, the Charter secured by Puritan John Winthrop, Jr., from Charles II. in 1662, and the present Constitution of this State, adopted in 1818, were the statement and guarantee of the principles of civil and religious liberty which was assured to the citizens of this Colony, and which we today enjoy. We shall find, if we make careful search, that our freedom and the free institutions of which we boast were of a Puritan source.

December 21, 1620, was an epoch-making date. The landing of the Pilgrims was an epoch-making event. It was the beginning of the planting of New England; it was the first stone laid in the foundation of this free government. The landing of John Winthrop and his company at Massachusetts Bay June 27 [17 o. s.], 1630, was another epoch-making event, and was the second step in the planting of New England. Winthrop wrote in his journal, a few days after his arrival: "Thursday, 17 [June]. We went to Mattachusetts to find out a place for our sitting down."

It is with this latter event that the civil and religious history of New London, and of Connecticut, is closely allied. The Arabella and her companions, not the Mayflower, brought to these shores the Colony from which came the men who planted Con-

necticut, and brought hither three or four of its earliest Churches. The planting of Connecticut was the third step in the planting of New England. The Churches brought hither from the Colony of Massachusetts Bay were the Church in Windsor, which emigrated from Dorchester in 1635 with Rev. John Warham; the first Church in Hartford, which emigrated from Cambridge in 1636 with Rev. Thomas Hooker, of whom it is said that he was quite as famous a preacher as John Cotton, who was the leading man of his times in Massachusetts; and the First Church of Christ, New London, which, as we expect to show, emigrated from Gloucester in 1651 with Rev. Richard Blinman, its first pastor. Besides these facts is this also, namely, that the authority under which John Winthrop, Jr., founded the Pequot Colony was given by the Legislature of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay.

It should be said, however, that the Puritans who came to Connecticut under the lead of Hooker, and those who settled New Haven under the lead of John Davenport and Theophilus Eaton, and the men who settled the Pequot Colony under the lead of John Winthrop, Jr., had quite as much of the free and liberal spirit of the Pilgrims of Plymouth as the Puritans of Massachusetts Bay, of whom John Cotton was the ecclesiastical head, who had not quite forgotten

the aristocratic spirit of the Church from which he fled. It was John Cotton who said that he did "not conceive that God ever did ordain" Democracy "as a fit government either for Church or Commonwealth." Hooker said, "In matters which concern the common good a general Council chosen by all to transact businesses which concern all I conceive most suitable to rule and most safe for relief for the whole." Thus it will be seen that these two men were wide apart in their notions of government. This was the sufficient reason why Hooker and his company did not remain in Massachusetts. Hooker's sentiment struck the keynote of popular liberty in civil affairs, afterwards promulgated in our Federal Constitution. It was the kind of Puritanism which was to dominate the Colony of Connecticut. It was in complete harmony with the language of the compact signed on board the Mayflower—we "doe by these presents solemnly and mutually in the presence of God and one of another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a Civill Body Politicke, for our better ordering and preservation and furtherance of the ends aforesaid; and by virtue hereof to enact, constitute and frame such just and equall Lawes, Ordinances, Acts, Constitutions, offices from time to time, as shall be thought most meet and convenient for the generall good of the Colony: vnto which we

promise all due submission and obedience." We shall find that the Puritanism which prevailed in Connecticut, determined as it was by the liberal spirit of Thomas Hooker, and John Davenport, and John Winthrop, Jr., was quite a different affair and of a far milder type than the Puritanism of Massachusetts Bay, which was dominated by the more austere and aristocratic spirit of John Cotton. And his notions of civil government were far less productive of free citizenship than were those of Thomas Hooker. Thus from the first Connecticut was to all intents and purposes a free and independent State, and when the War of the Revolution broke out, this Colony had little to gain from it in the way of civil liberty. For under its Charter, which was but a restatement of Hooker's Constitution, every citizen had all the rights of Englishmen under the Crown, and elected their own Governors—a privilege accorded to none of the other Colonies, save Rhode Island. So that the Puritanism of Connecticut always made for the freedom of the citizen under the laws. Thus the stamp of Puritanism was upon the civil and religious foundations of this Commonwealth.

The first minister in New London of whom we have any account was Rev. Thomas Peters, an uncle of Mrs. Winthrop, who had been acting as chaplain to Mr. Fenwick and the garrison stationed at Say-

brook. When the plan of a settlement at Pequot was proposed, he entered heartily into it, doubtless with the expectation of becoming a permanent resident, and, it may be, of exercising his functions as a clergyman. It is not at all unlikely that during his stay divine services were held. This was in 1646. The Legislature of Massachusetts, in its act by which it incorporated the Pequot plantation, associated him with Mr. Winthrop "for the better carrying on of the plantation."

Mr. Peters was a Puritan clergyman who had been ejected from his parish in Cornwall, England. He was a brother of the famous Hugh Peters, of Salem, who was with Hooker in Holland, and who came to New England in 1635. [Punchard's Hist. Cong'lsm, vol. iv, pp. 57, 58.] In the autumn of 1646 he was called back to his former flock in Cornwall, and left Pequot never to return. Mr. Edward Winslow writes in 1647: "Mr. Thomas Peters, a minister that was driven out of Cornwall by Sir Ralph Hop-ton in these late wars, and fled to New England for shelter, being called back by his people, and now in London." It is not known that there was any other clergyman in this Colony until Richard Blinman came in 1650. It does not follow, however, that there were no religious services, for in those days it was customary for laymen, especially deacons, to hold

services in the absence of clergymen. Here, then, we find finger-marks of Puritanism on the foundations of Connecticut and of New London. If we look carefully, we shall find them more clearly defined.

John Winthrop, Jr., the founder of New London, was the eldest son of John Winthrop, Sr., the first governor of Massachusetts. He was born in Groton, England, February 12, 1606. His family was one of substance and of honorable repute. His father, unless we except himself, was the most distinguished Puritan in civil life of the seventeenth century. His home at Groton was in the cradle of Puritanism. Huntingdonshire on the west gave Oliver Cromwell to the world. At the University of Cambridge, near by, had studied some of the leading Separatists and Puritans of the times. Among them were these, whose names are famous in New England history—John Robinson, John Cotton, John Winthrop, Sr., Thomas Hooker. The Winthrop family were of the Puritan faith. Every breath which the younger Winthrop drew was tinctured with it. It ran in the blood in his veins. It was a foregone conclusion that he would be a Puritan. He could not well have been anything else, without violating all the laws of heredity. He was descended from Adam Winthrop, a rich clothier of Suffolk, a man of piety, of culture,

and of great strength and decision of character. Of his father, John Winthrop, Sr., it is said, "he was exemplary for his grave Christian deportment," and it is thought that at one time he contemplated entering the ministry. But he finally turned his attention to the law.

When John Winthrop, Jr. came to New England, like his father he became a Congregationalist. His religious character was such as to give ground for the belief that he was one of the earliest promoters of this Church, and that when it came here in 1651, he became a member of it. Certainly he was one of its adherents.

He came to New England in 1631. Four years later, under a commission to build a fort at Saybrook, he became the first Governor on Connecticut soil—a post which he held for a year. In 1645 he broke ground for the Pequot Colony, which became a legal fact, by act of the Massachusetts legislature, May 6, 1646. In 1657 he was chosen Governor, and went to reside at Hartford. With the exception of a single year he was annually re-elected till he died. April 20, 1662, he secured the charter from Charles II., which united the Connecticut and the New Haven colonies under one jurisdiction, with himself for Governor. He was no common man, says Dr. Trumbull.

The reasons for the great Puritan exodus from England under Endicott in 1628, under Winthrop in 1630, with Hooker, Cotton and Stone in 1633, and with John Davenport in 1637, are not far to find. The religious and political condition of affairs in England was repulsive in the extreme to the Puritans, who represented the Evangelical element in the Church of England. Charles I. was King. Laud was practically, as in 1633 he became actually, primate, and at the head of ecclesiastical affairs. He formed the purpose to raise the English Church to be a reformed branch of the great Catholic Church. In keeping therewith he sternly repressed the Puritan spirit. All hope of purifying the Church was at an end. Non-conformity within it was driven to be separation from it. Under the pressure, some of the best blood of England was driven out of it to find a home where there would be freedom to worship God according to the dictates of one's conscience, and to hold views agreeable to the Evangelical spirit. The pioneer band of Pilgrims, who had come to Plymouth in 1620, were sending back tidings of the religious liberty which they were enjoying. These reports awakened in the breasts of the harried Puritans "the dream of a land in the West where religion and liberty could find a safe and lasting home." [Green's short Hist. of the Eng. People, p 498]. In 1628 the Massachusetts

company had established a colony at Salem with John Endicott as Governor. A charter was secured from the King which established the colony at Massachusetts Bay, in which Salem was included. John Winthrop was chosen Governor, October 20, 1629. He set sail, and led the largest Puritan exodus to these shores, in the next year.

I can not forbear to quote what Green says of this company of immigrants to these shores who fled from the persecutions and intolerance of the Old World, and its established religious customs and beliefs: "They were in great part men of the professional and middle classes; some of them men of large landed estate, some zealous clergymen like Cotton, Hooker, and Roger Williams, some shrewd London lawyers or young scholars from Oxford. The bulk were God-fearing farmers from Lincolnshire and the eastern counties. They desired, in fact, 'only the best' as sharers in their enterprise, men driven forth from their fatherland not by earthly want, or by the lust of adventure, but by the fear of God, and the zeal for a godly worship." [Ibid].

After signing a compact to go to Massachusetts as its Governor, Mr. Winthrop wrote to his son, John Winthrop, Jr., a careful statement of reasons for the new plantation in New England. The following memorable reply shows how deeply the son entered

into sympathy with the religious sentiments of his father. “For the business of New England, I can say no other thing, but that I believe confidently, that the whole disposing thereof is of the Lord, who disposeth all alterations, by his blessed will, to his own glory and the good of his; and, therefore, do assure myself, that all things shall work together for the best therein. And for myself, I have seen so much of the vanity of the world, that I esteem no more of the diversities of countries, than as so many inns, whereof the traveller that hath lodged in the best, or in the worst, findeth no difference, when he cometh to his journey’s end; and I shall call that my country, where I may most glorify God, and enjoy the presence of my dearest friends. Therefore herein I submit myself to God’s will and yours, and with your leave, do dedicate myself (laying by all desire of other employments whatsoever) to the service of God and the company herein, with the whole endeavors both of body and mind.” Hon. Robert C. Winthrop well says of this reply that “it is a memorable letter in New England history.” It, without doubt, confirmed the father in his purpose, and may be considered the casting vote which decided the planting of New England. Certainly the movement to Massachusetts, out of which came the movement which planted colonies at Hartford, at New

Haven, and at Pequot, was undertaken in that spirit of reliance upon God, which was characteristic of the Separatist and Puritan revolts from the corruptions in life, belief and worship of the Established Church.

While some left England without thought of separating from its Church, yet on arriving here, almost their first step was out of its communion. Winthrop's first act, within a month after landing at Charlestown, was to join in the formation of a Congregational Church, as an embodied expression of the Puritanism which he had embraced while yet in England. The settlers of Connecticut followed this most worthy practice. The gathering of a Church was a formal expression of their purpose in coming to these shores, and of the deep religious character of the men who were engaged in those majestic movements across the sea in search of civil and religious liberty. As John Winthrop, Sr., planted a Church when he planted a Colony, so we have reason to believe that it was in the purpose of John Winthrop, Jr., to do. But whereas John Winthrop had a large number associated with him to gather into a Church at the first, with John Winthrop, Jr., the case was far different.

John Winthrop, Jr., was a Puritan; but his puritanism was not of the severe type. Witches and Quakers, and Ann Hutchinson were summarily dealt

with in Massachusetts. But it is not on record that the first settlers of Connecticut, and of New London, ever lifted the hand of persecution against a single person because of his religious beliefs. People were punished severely for breaking the laws; but they were not put to torture for holding their convictions.

Here we may introduce some of the men who were contemporary with Winthrop, and who were foremost in planting the colonies which were afterwards united to form Connecticut. As we have seen, Thomas Hooker led his Church from Cambridge, through the wilderness, to a home at Hartford, on the banks of the Connecticut, in 1636. He died in 1647, the year after the planting of the Pequot Colony. Dr. Dunning says [Congregationalists in America p 150] "the first constitution of Connecticut, adopted in 1639, was largely the work of Thomas Hooker, and was the first written constitution in history which resulted in a civil government. Our present National Government is in direct descent from that formed on this constitution, which marked the beginning of democracy. Connecticut made to Massachusetts the first propositions which resulted in the confederacy of the New England colonies, and in this movement also the hand of Hooker is conspicuous." This early constitution was the model followed in

drafting the charter of 1662, which was so broad and liberal in its provisions, and so amply secured to the inhabitants of the Colony the fullest rights of citizenship, and of religious conviction, that it remained the constitutional law, without revision, more than forty years after the Colony became a State. But Thomas Hooker was a Puritan, driven out of England into Holland because of his religious convictions. If Hooker's constitution was the beginning of a democratic form of government in the world, if, as some allege, it was the first draft of our national declaration of independence, and of our national constitution, then the world, and we of today owe no small debt to the Puritanism of Connecticut, as it was expressed by the liberal spirit of Thomas Hooker.

Among the early Puritans who settled Connecticut is to be named another man of great moral and intellectual force and stature. He was a great preacher, and there were associated with him laymen of like qualities. I refer to Rev. John Davenport, who founded the Quinnipiack Colony in 1639. He remained in New Haven till 1670, and was therefore contemporary with nearly the whole of Mr. Winthrop's official life, and was his personal friend. These men gave tone to the life of the Colony. They determined its civil and its religious character. What some are pleased to denominate the Blue Laws of

Connecticut, were simply expressions of those high moral convictions of right and wrong, which are essential to the largest and most perfect freedom. The Puritans believed that he is the freest man who is most obedient to duty and to what is right.

I can not stop to speak in detail of Theophilus Eaton, the first Governor of the New Haven Colony, nor of William Janes, the first teacher of that Colony, nor of a good many others of like qualities. Trumbull says of these early Puritan settlers of Connecticut, that "they were of the first class of settlers, and all, except the ministers, were chosen magistrates or Governors of the Colony." They were picked men which the Puritan exodus brought to Massachusetts and passed on to Connecticut. "They formed its free and happy constitution, were its legislators, and some of the chief pillars of the church and commonwealth." They were Puritans. They were Calvinists. They were Congregationalists. They believed in the supreme headship of Christ. They were therefore dissenters from the Church of England. The clergy "were distinguished for literature, piety, and ministerial gifts." "They were mighty and abundant in prayer." They were eminently men of God, and undershepherds of the flocks committed to their charge.

The men immediately associated with Mr. Winthrop in the settlement of the Pequot Colony are, some of them, worthy of special notice. The first town clerk was Jonathan Brewster, who came to New London before 1650. He was a son of Elder William Brewster, of the Mayflower. He appears as "Clarke of the Town of Pequett" in September, 1649. February 25 of that year he was one of four who were chosen "townsmen," or selectmen. In 1650 he was made a freeman of Connecticut with Mr. Winthrop, and in September of that year he appeared at the General Court as one of the first deputies from Pequot. He was one of four who were always entitled Mr. when spoken of in connection with the plantation. He was evidently a prominent man, and took a leading part in the affairs of the new settlement. Of his staunch Puritanism there can be no question. He died in 1661.

Another prominent man, who appeared still earlier upon the scene and who lived to a later date, was Thomas Miner. He came to New England with John Winthrop, the elder, in the *Arabella*, in 1630. He first settled in Boston, and then in Hingham. From there he came to New London in 1645, and was one of the advance party who broke ground here in that year. In 1647 he was appointed "to act in all Town affaires" in the capacity of selectman. This election

was repeated the following year. In his diary are a good many entries showing that he was engaged in the transaction of the town's business. In 1649 he "was appointed 'Military Sergeant in the Towne of Pequitt,' with power to call forth and train the inhabitants." In 1650 he appeared with Jonathan Brewster as one of the first deputies to the General Court from the new Colony. He was a member of the First Church of Christ. In 1674 he united with others to form the first Church in Stonington, and was one of its first deacons. He was prominent in founding both New London and Stonington. His son John moved to Woodbury and became the founder of a family. His son Clement lived in New London and was deacon of the Church. He was a man of strong character and of pronounced religious convictions. His diary records repeated instances of attendance upon the ordinances of the gospel. He died October 23, 1690, aged 83. Robert Hempstead, Carie Latham, Thomas Stanton and others were associated with Winthrop in the founding of the town. They were religious men, they were, most, if not all of them Church members, and they were of the Puritan faith. Thomas Stanton was, with Thomas Miner, an original member of the first Church in Stonington, and was prominent in its affairs till he died in 1678. Puritanism left its mark upon the foundations of the town.

Another contemporary of John Winthrop, Jr., who was associated with him in giving character to the town, and who was a Puritan, was Richard Blinman, the first pastor of the Church, and of the town. When he was driven from his living in England, he came to Marshfield, and fifty or more persons followed him for the sake of their religious convictions. The same people followed him to Gloucester in 1642, and to New London in 1650. They were Puritans. They constituted the Church, which was thus an organized embodiment of their Puritan principles. They at once became prominent in the affairs of the town, both at Gloucester and in New London, and stamped their character on the institutions which they planted.

Some of the men who came to New London because Mr. Blinman came may be named as examples of the whole. Robert Park, and his son Thomas, came to New England about 1635 or 1636. They seem to have settled in Watertown, Mass., whence they emigrated to Wethersfield. They came to New London in 1649 or 1650, probably because Mr. Blinman, Thomas Park's brother-in-law, was coming.

The leading man who followed Mr. Blinman from Chepstow was Obadiah Bruen. He was town clerk in Gloucester, and in Pequot till he removed to New Jersey in 1667. He was a member of this Church,

and of the Puritan faith. Miss Caulkins says of him, "during the sixteen years in which Mr. Bruen dwelt in the young plantation, he was perhaps more intimately identified with its public concerns than any other man. He was chosen a townsman for fifteen years in succession, and except the first year, uniformly first townsman and moderator." He was on all committees, was recorder of the town, and clerk of the court. His was the only name in New London on the Charter of Charles II. "He appears to have been a persevering, plodding, able and discreet man," who did a great deal, helped everybody, and left everything better for his management.

James Avery seems to have come to New London with Mr. Blinman. He was a member of this Church. He was a man of prominence and influence. He founded a large family which bears his name. He was chosen townsman for twenty-three years, and represented the town in the General Court twelve times. He lived on Poquonnock Plain in the old Avery homestead recently destroyed by fire, till he died about 1694.

Capt. George Denison was prominent in all the affairs of the Colony after his arrival in 1651. He also was a member of this Church. He came to America with his father, William Denison, in The Lyon, with John Elliot of Roxbury. In 1654

he moved to the east side of the Mystic River, and was interested in the founding of Stonington and its first Church. He was a Puritan. Although he had frequent disputes with his neighbors, and had difficulty with his minister, as will appear, yet he was a strong man of very decided opinions.

John Coit was of Mr. Blinman's company who came from Gloucester. He followed his pastor from Wales. He was of the Puritan faith. He was prominent in the affairs of the town. He also founded a family which still bears his name. He was a member of this Church. His son, Joseph, became a deacon of it, and the ancestor of all the Coits in Connecticut, and perhaps in the United States.

Andrew Lester is another member of the Blinman company, who was a member of the Church, and whose family name survives him. Such were the men who were the founders of the town and the Church. They were Puritans. Many of them had been driven out of England by religious persecutions. They were men of strong convictions; else they would not have chosen expatriation rather than surrender their beliefs. Whether we agree with them or not, we must applaud their heroism; for the men who are willing to suffer for the sake of what they believe to be a fundamental principle of civil and of religious liberty, are worthy of all praise. If their notions of

religious liberty are less latitudinarian than some of today, we must remember the times in which they lived, and the school of religious toleration in which they were trained. Even then we may well ask if a little less latitude is not to be desired. At any rate it is pretty difficult for a candid mind to sneer at these men.

They were pretty severe sometimes; quite as severe on themselves as on any one else. For example, Nathaniel Mather wrote in his diary: "Of all the manifold sins which then (in childhood) I was guilty of, none so sticks upon me as that, being very young, I was whittling on the Sabbath day." Another records that "he lived in prayer thrice a day and 'did not slabber over his prayers with hasty amputations, but wrestled in them for a good part of an hour;'" that he "chewed much on excellent sermons," and spent much time over his Bible. It must be confessed that this sounds strange in these times. But it is to be remembered that the spirit of those days was congenial to such exercises and experiences. It would sound strange now to read records of the police court like these which are to be found in the early records of New London: "Goodwife Willey presented" to the court, "for not attending public worship, and bringing her children thither; fined five shillings;" "John Lewis and Sarah Chapman presented for sit-

ting together on the Lord's day, under an apple tree in Goodman Chapman's orchard," and many more like these. They show the sterling character of the men who laid here the civil, social and religious foundations of the State and of the town. Nor are instances like the above to be judged in the light of present public sentiment, but in the light of the public sentiment of those times. Those men may seem narrow to us, but they were fully abreast of the best thought of their own day.

Thus the founders of this town and Church were Puritans of a most pronounced type. They protested against the Church of England, because it stood for intolerance. Hooker came to Connecticut because he could not endure the aristocratic notions of John Cotton, which prevailed in Massachusetts. The men who came to Connecticut and New London represented the largest liberty, as it was then understood. They took their stand upon the word of God. So that when a Colony was planted, civil and religious freedom were framed into its constitution.

The founder of this town was a Puritan. The first minister of the Church, and most of the original members, who followed him from Chepstow, by way of Marshfield and Gloucester, to New London, were Puritans. The second minister was the son of a Puritan—Rev. Peter Bulkeley, of Concord, Mass. The

third minister was the son of a Puritan Governor of Massachusetts—Simon Bradstreet. The fourth minister, Gurdon Saltonstall, was of Puritan descent. This town and Church had their origin in Puritanism of no uncertain kind.

The founders of this town and Church were not illiterate adventurers. They were the men of culture and learning of their times. We may not like their creed, but it was an emphatic protest against corruption in social life, in the Church and in the State. They were uncompromisingly loyal to their convictions. When we put their sturdy adherence to what they felt ought to be, by the side of the easy way in which truth and duty are sometimes dealt with, we find it pretty difficult to laugh at Puritanism. We may not like their methods. We may not like the men. But their sincerity is above impeachment. The Church which they erected on the principles for which they sacrificed themselves, is their fitting monument.

III.

ORIGIN OF THE FIRST CHURCH OF CHRIST.

It was the habit of godly men in the ancient times to set up an altar to God on the spot where they pitched their tents ; to erect a sanctuary in the place where they established their home. Thus Abraham and Jacob built an altar to the Lord at Bethel ; Moses built an altar to Jehovah Nissi on the field where Amalek was defeated by Israel ; a Tabernacle for the worship of God was erected in the Wilderness. The Pilgrims of Plymouth brought their Church with them to these shores. One of their very first acts was to build a house for it. The Puritans who landed at Salem in 1628 formed a Church August 6 of the next year. The company of Governor Winthrop, which landed at Charlestown in June, 1630, organized a Church on the 30th day of the following month. On the same day another group of the same company organized a Church at Watertown, where they had gone to fix their dwelling place. The custom of those early days was either to transport the already organized Church, as was done by the Pilgrims of Plymouth in 1620, and by the company

which settled in Dorchester June 6, 1630, or, at the earliest possible moment after establishing their homes in a given place, to organize a Church. Our purpose is to state reasons for believing that at the earliest possible moment after founding New London the prevailing course was pursued, and the First Church of Christ was planted in New London as early as 1651. When John Winthrop, Jr., "removed his family from Boston in October, 1646, * * * and dwelt during the first winter at Fishers Island," and finally settled them in New London in 1647, we may believe that he did not remove them from the religious privileges which were so highly prized, for any period longer than the necessities of the case required.

As we have already seen, Rev. Thomas Peters was associated with Mr. Winthrop "for the better carrying on the work of said plantation." It is probable that preaching the gospel was in the minds of the Massachusetts Legislature when this vote was passed. The Colony was small at this time. It did not receive any considerable accessions till the company came from Cape Ann, in 1650 and 1651. This may account for the fact that there appears to have been no Church organization previous to the latter year. We expect to show that from 1651 to the present this Church has existed in this town. Inasmuch as there is no record

of the organization of a Church either before or after 1651, we expect to show that, as the First Church in Hartford emigrated with its pastor, Rev. Thomas Hooker, from Newtown (now Cambridge), Mass., in 1636, so the First Church of New London emigrated with its pastor, Rev. Richard Blinman, from Gloucester, Mass., in 1651.

It is worth noticing here, as helping to establish this view, that Mr. Blinman, as will be seen, was well and favorably known to the Winthrops during his ministry in Gloucester. It seems likely that John Winthrop, Jr., became apprised of the fact that Mr. Blinman would be willing to remove from Gloucester, and that many of the Cape Ann planters could be persuaded to emigrate to parts having a more fertile soil, and that he held out such inducements as brought about such an exodus from Gloucester. For it is known that Cape Ann lane was opened for their accommodation, and was given this name in honor of the place from which they had removed as one of the inducements held out to them to come to Pequot. In this way Winthrop secured a large and valuable accession to the population of the new Colony, and at the same time secured a Church and its pastor. As a matter of fact, the people from Cape Ann were the majority of the Colony, and at once took a leading part in all its affairs.

The date of the earliest records of the Church is October 5, 1670. This was the date of Mr. Bradstreet's ordination, as we learn from his own diary and that of Thomas Miner. His actual ministry began four years before, in 1666. The reason why his ordination was delayed does not appear. But his four years of previous service point to an organized Church which he served. His ordination, October 5, 1670, points to an organized Church, over which he was ordained as pastor. Because the records do not begin till the date of Mr. Bradstreet's ordination Dr. Trumbull erroneously concludes, "there seems to have been no Church in New London till the ordination of Mr. Bradstreet." But we expect to show from the records of the Church, from the current expressions of the times, and from various other considerations that there was a Church before that date, and that it had been here at least nineteen years and a half when Mr. Bradstreet was settled over it as its pastor.

The FIRST thing to be said is that it seems not to have been the custom of those early times, at least in New London, to keep careful records. For example, it was not till February 6, 1660, that the town awoke fully to the importance of taking measures to preserve public documents and records of its doings. In the next place, it is a fact that there are but

five entries of Church action made upon the records of the Church between October 5, 1670, and 1757. Further, it evidently was not Mr. Blinman's habit to keep records; partly, it may be, because the chief business of the Church was done in town meeting, and partly, perhaps, because he lacked the methodical turn of mind essential in a good recorder of events. We learn from contemporary sources that a Church was gathered in Gloucester, by Rev. Richard Blinman, in 1642. Thus Rev. Dr. Joseph S. Clark, in his *Congregational Churches of Massachusetts*, says [p. 33], "in the same year, 1642, Rev. Richard Blinman and several Welsh families" (Punchard gives the number of persons as about fifty) "who had recently located at Marshfield, removed to Gloucester, and uniting with a small colony of fishermen already on the ground, were formed into a Church under his pastoral care." But Babson's *History of Gloucester* says "neither record or tradition" of the first Church in Gloucester "has handed down any account of its members or its early proceedings, nor of its history for sixty years." Then the absence of records prior to October 5, 1670, proves nothing against the existence of a Church here previous to that date.

The **SECOND** thing to be borne in mind is, that the habits of the times, and the character of the men

engaged in planting this town, afford the strongest presumption that they would not let a quarter of a century pass without an organized Church. These men, as we have seen, were Puritans. They were Calvinists in their belief. They became Congregationalists in Church discipline and order on arriving in America. They believed in the supreme headship of Christ. They believed that the New Testament was the perfect rule, not only of faith and practice, but also of worship and discipline. They believed that Churches ought to be formed and governed after the pattern which they believed could be found in the New Testament. For this reason they were dissenters from the national establishment. They believed that the same principles should govern the State. The clergy were eminently men of God. "As they had taken up the cross, forsaken their pleasant seats and enjoyments in their native country, and followed their Savior into a land not sown, for the sake of his holy religion, and the advancement of his Kingdom, they sacrificed all worldly interests to these glorious purposes. The people who followed them (the clergy) into the wilderness, were their spiritual children, who imbibed the same spirit and sentiments, and esteemed them as their fathers in Christ." [Trumbull, vol. i, pp. 261-2.] These were the leading men of the Colony. They were most exemplary

in their manner of life. The almost stern regard for the Sabbath, the penalties inflicted upon men and women for neglecting the house of God, or for disturbing public worship on the Lord's day, forbid us to suppose that men of such temper would allow themselves to settle a town without providing for preaching the gospel, and, as soon as circumstances would permit, organizing a Church upon the simple plan of the New Testament. As we have seen, Mr. Winthrop, and those associated with him, were men of this stamp.

It is further to be said that Mr. Winthrop seems from the first to have had it in mind to erect a house of worship. For the high ridge, on which the old cemetery lies, was called Meeting House hill from the foundation of the town. Further, this ancient cemetery, which was in use the year before, was solemnly dedicated by vote of the town, June 6, 1653, to purposes of burial. The vote declares, "it shall ever bee for a Common Buriall place, and never be impropriated by any." Burial grounds were, in those early days, Church yards. Then we have good reason to believe that it was in the mind of the founders of the town to have an organized Church at the earliest possible moment.

It is further to be said, as confirming this view, that Mr. Peters undoubtedly came here to be the

shepherd of the new Colony, and we have reason to believe that during his brief stay there were worshipping assemblies to whom he ministered. These worshipping assemblies, though they were not organized into an ecclesiastical body, were a distinct expression of the purpose of the men who first settled here, to organize a Church as soon as it could be done. As we shall see, no evidence can be found that an organized Church was on the ground till Mr. Blinman and his followers moved hither from Gloucester. With their coming the Church idea, which evidently had from the first been in the minds of the original settlers, found formal expression and embodiment. The organized Church which, as we expect to show, was brought to New London from Gloucester, took up into itself those disciples which it found on the ground. Thus the First Church was planted here as a definite execution of the purpose which seems all along to have been in the minds of Winthrop and his associates, and as a formal, organic expression of fellowship in Christ.

The THIRD thing to be observed is, that there is no account of the organization of the Church, at the ordination of Mr. Bradstreet in 1670. Nor is any account of its organization at any time in Connecticut, to be found. Then we conclude that it never was organized in Connecticut. For by a law passed in March, 1658, it was declared that no persons

within the jurisdiction of Connecticut, should organize themselves into a Church "without consent of the General Court, and approbation of the neighbor Churches." Hon. Richard A. Wheeler says, had an attempt been made, after the passage of said Act, without consulting the General Court, it "would have thundered its anathemas against them, and the colonial records would have contained their proceedings chapter and verse." But no request for the privilege of forming a Church here can be found, nor are any anathemas recorded against any for illegal proceedings in forming a Church without permission of the General Court. Therefore no Church was formed here after 1658. Furthermore, previous to the passage of this Act, it was customary to apply to the legislature, which, in those days, was a sort of standing ecclesiastical body, for permission to be organized into a Church ; as appears from a vote of this body, in April, 1636, with reference to the organization of a Church at Watertown, now Wethersfield. The vote reads that whereas several were dismissed from Watertown, Mass., to form a Church "in this River of Connectecott," and the said parties have done so, "it is therefore in this present court ratified and confirmed." If the men from Gloucester brought letters to be constituted into a Church here, as in the case of these emigrants from Watertown to Wethersfield,

we should expect to find some record of the fact and an application, like theirs, to the colonial legislature, with a similar consenting vote of that body. But nothing of the kind can be found. And yet we shall find evidences that a Church was here as early as 1651. That an event so important as the formation of a Church should be left without a scrap of notice seems utterly incredible; and this is the only case, so far as I can find, if this Church was organized and no record of the event was made. But there is no record of the organization of a Church in Pequot at any time, nor is there one with which the origin of this Church can be connected, save that of the Church in Gloucester, Mass., in 1642. There is, then, but one conclusion, namely, that this Church was already organized when it came to New London, like the Churches at Hartford and Windsor; that it was brought here from Gloucester, and that the worshippers already on the ground were incorporated into it, and thus a Church was constituted in New London.

We now come **FOURTHLY** to consider certain evidences which seem to leave no room to doubt the correctness of this view. To begin with, at the time of his ordination Mr. Bradstreet had preached here over four years, and had been preceded by two men, one of whom had served in the office of pastor in New London seven years, and the other

three years. Further, Oct. 5, 1670, Mr. Bradstreet began to keep the records of a Church already in existence. For the title of the ancient book, written in the hand of Mr. Bradstreet reads, "the records of the Church of Christ at New London, wherein are the names of the Church now being October 5, 1670, with the names of all such as have been baptized and added thereto from the said 5th of October, 1670." The first entry upon these records reads, "names of those who were of the Church of New London in full communion, Oct. 5, 1670." Then follow twenty-four names of those who comprised the Church on that date. They are as follows: "Lieut. James Avery and wife, Thomas Miner and wife, James Morgan, Sen., and wife, William Meades and wife, Mr. William Douglas and wife, John Smith and wife, Mr. Ralph Parker and wife, William Hough and wife, William Nichols, Robert Royce, John Prentice, Mrs. Rogers, Goodwife Gallup of Mystick, Goodwife Keeney, Goodwife Coyte, Goodwife Lewis. Mr. James Rogers not long after owned a member here, being a member in full communion in Milford Church." Now it is to be noticed that this is not the record of the formation of a Church, but of the members who composed "the Church now being." Evidently we are to understand that these are the records,

and these the members, of a Church already organized when the records were commenced. This view is emphasized by three other facts. One is an entry in the ancient records which reads, "the names of such as were called children of the Church, viz. of such as had been baptized before Oct. 5, 1670, their parents one or both being in full communion." But to be "in full communion" before October 5, 1670, points to an organized Church before that date. The second fact is, that an entry in the same records says that Lydia Bailey and Ruth Hill, who had children baptized on that date, were received into the Church February 12, 1670, eight months previous to October 5, 1670. The third fact is, an entry in the diary of Thomas Miner, whose name appears on the list of those who were members October 5, 1670, under date of July 27, 1670, which reads as follows: "I and my wife were at New London, and Goodman Rice, and Goodman Hough were received into the Church there." Then as early as February 12 and July 27, 1670, there was a Church in New London.

About 1652 Thomas Miner had removed to Pawcatuck, but had retained his membership in New London. Indeed Pawcatuck was then within the limits of New London. Under date of June 30, 1669, he writes in his diary, "I was at New London and had testimony from the Church for me and my wife being

owned to be under their watch." The "testimony," recorded in his diary, was as follows: "These are to signify to all whome it may concerne, that we whose names are underwritten, being members of the Church of Christ at New London, do own Thomas Miner of Stonington, and his wife, members with us, and under our care and watch, and they do live, for aught we know or hear, as doe become Christians. James Avery, William Douglas. In the name and behalf of the Church. New London, June 30, 1669."

Then there was a Church in New London as early as the date of this testimony.

Ten years before, in 1659, in anticipation of his return to England, Mr. Blinman sold his house and lot, and his farm at the Harbor's mouth. In the deed he says: "I, Richard Blinman, late pastor of the Church of Christ at New London." As he left New London the year before, about January 28, and went to New Haven, there was a Church here in 1658. In May of that year Thomas Miner makes this record in his diary: "Satterday the 15 there is a Church meeting at towne." He also records the fact that July 8, 1655, and afterwards, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was administered in New London. But that sacrament was always administered to Churches, and never to towns. Further, October 22, 1655, Thomas Miner in his diary speaks of

Thomas Park, as "deacon perke." But a deacon is an officer of a Church. In another entry in his diary he says, "Sabath day the 28 of October [1655] hannah was baptized." This proves that there was a Church, and that Mr. Blinman was its regularly installed pastor, administering the ordinances at that date. In 1654, in a written memorandum, Mr. Obadiah Bruen, the town clerk, speaks of Mr. Blinman as "pastor of the Church of Christ at Pequot."

A controversy arose in which Mr. Blinman became involved, concerning the proposed new town of Mystic and Pawcatuck. Sharp words passed between him, and Thomas Miner and Captain Denison. August 28, 1654, a town meeting was held at Pequot to consider the controversy, and adopt conciliatory measures for the adjustment of the differences between Pequot, and Mystic and Pawcatuck. In the evening of the same day the Church met at the house of Mr. Caulkins in Pequot. Mr. Thomas Miner made the following record of that meeting in his diary : "I was sent for at Pequot for to be reconciled to the Church, and at evening the major part met at Goodman Caulkins' house, namely: Mr. Blinman, Mr. Bruen, Goodman Morgan, Goodman Caulkins, Ralph Parker, Goodman Lester, Goodman Coit, Hugh Roberts, Capt. Denison, and Goodman Cheseborough and Thomas Miner being there. All these

took satisfaction in my acknowledging the height of my spirit; secondly, in that I saw my evil in sudden and rash speaking to Mr. Blinman, and with all this was acknowledgement on the Church's part that I was wronged; so all was passed by on my side and the Church's, with promise on both parts—as that, all former offences should be buried, and never more to be agitated; so desiring the prayers, each for the other, we parted from that meeting August 28, 1654." Now it is to be noticed that this was not a town meeting. That had been held during the day. It was a meeting of persons whose names are given and who composed the major part of the Church, was held in the evening of the same day, was convened at the house of Goodman Caulkins, one of the members, and was held for the express purpose of adjusting differences between Mr. Blinman and Thomas Miner on account of hot words which the latter had spoken to his pastor, because the pastor had taken sides against setting Mystic and Pawcatuck apart from Pequot in a township by themselves. Then there was a Church in New London August 28, 1654; and prior to this date, for Mr. Miner speaks of a mutual adjustment of "former offences." We have thus come down to within less than four years of the time when Mr. Blinman came to New London. At every

point we find a Church in organic existence, and exercising all the functions of a Church.

We have the testimony of Capt. James Avery, William Douglas, Thomas Miner, Obadiah Bruen, and the records of the Church, that there was a Church here prior to 1670 ; and we have the testimony of Obadiah Bruen, and of Mr. Blinman himself, that Mr. Blinman was pastor of the Church of Christ at Pequot prior to 1658, in January of which year he left his charge. We have the testimony of Thomas Miner that he was a member of the same Church prior to 1654. And if he was a member prior to this date, so were Mr. Bruen, and Mr. Caulkins, and Mr. Cheseborough, and Ralph Parker, and Mr. Coit and all the others concerned in that Church meeting August 28, 1654. If in about three years after Mr. Blinman came to Pequot, we find a Church organized, and in full performance of the customary functions of a Church, it does not seem to be a violent inference that, when Mr. Blinman came here in 1650, he came as pastor of the First Church of Christ.

It signifies nothing against this view that neither Mr. Blinman nor Mr. Bulkeley were ordained at New London. Mr. Blinman was already an ordained clergyman, having been set apart to that sacred office in England, and having already served as pastor of the Church in Gloucester, Mass., eight years. His

case was precisely like that of Mr. Whitfield and the Church in Guilford. That Church was gathered June 19, 1643, "and Mr. Whitfield, who brought with him from England a considerable portion of this Church (in Guilford), was received as pastor, without the formality of an ordination." [Punchard's Hist. of Cong., vol. iv, p. 105.] The case of Mr. Blinman is almost exactly parallel. He brought with him from England to Marshfield, and thence to Gloucester, and thence to New London, by far the larger part of those who composed the Church, and naturally as Mr. Whitfield was and for like reason, he was received as pastor without the formality of an ordination. Mr. Bulkeley declined ordination here, and preached only as a supply. His ordination did not take place till he went to Weathersfield.

Then we come, **FIFTHLY**, to the question, Whence came this Church, and where was it organized? An answer to these questions will explain why, as Miss Caulkins has said, "neither the Church nor the town records allude to any organization." The reason of this silence is not far to find. The Church was not organized here, nor in Connecticut. For if it had been, there would have been some vote of the colonial legislature permitting its organization. But, as has been said, there is neither application for permission, nor vote granting the permission to be organized into

a Church, to be found on the records of the colonial legislature. But the Church was organized somewhere at some time. Where, if not at Gloucester, and when, if not in 1642, and by Richard Blinman and his Welsh friends who had followed him from England? This is the point I hope to establish.

In support of this view of the origin of this Church, and its appearance in New London, it is to be said that it was the custom of those times for Churches to emigrate. The pastor, with a majority of the members, constituted the Church; and where they moved, it moved. Thus the first Church in Hartford was organized in Newtown, now Cambridge, Mass., in 1632. The famous Thomas Hooker was its pastor. In 1636, as we have seen, Thomas Hooker and about one hundred men, women and children—the whole recognized Church—went from Cambridge to Hartford. For Dr. Joseph S. Clark, in his history of the "Congregational Churches of Massachusetts," says [p. 16] "the Cambridge Church having decided to emigrate in a body to Connecticut, with their ministers, Hooker and Stone (which they did in the summer of 1636, and became the founders, and First Church in Hartford), another company of newly arrived pilgrims stood ready to take their places, and were embodied on the first day of the preceding February, with Rev.

Thomas Shepard for their minister. The same is now the 'Shepard Church' of that city." The Church at Windsor was organized in Plymouth, England, March, 1630; was planted at Dorchester, June 6 of the same year, and was removed to Windsor in 1635-6. Dr. Clark says [Ibid.], "a large portion of the Dorchester Church having removed in a body to Connecticut, and planted the town and Church of Windsor, the residuum, joined by other newcomers, were organized August 23, 1636, into the present First Church of Dorchester, and Rev. Richard Mather was ordained over them the same day." Thus these two Connecticut Churches were transplanted from Massachusetts into Connecticut. October 11, 1639, the majority of the Church in Scituate moved to Barnstable, and Scituate was left without a Church till another was organized.

Exactly the same thing, it seems, took place in connection with this Church. Mr. Blinman came here in the autumn of 1650. Twenty or more families, about one hundred souls, came with him, or followed soon after. These composed the great majority, if not the entire membership, of the Church in Gloucester. For a contemporary says that the number gathered into a Church there in 1642 was about fifty. It is not probable that this number was very greatly changed during Mr. Blinman's pastorate at Glouce-

ter. They decided to remove to New London, with their pastor, in 1650-51, and came. In accordance with the custom of the times, they with their pastor being the large majority, were the Church, as in the case of the Churches in Cambridge and Dorchester and Scituate.

It is true that there is no record that those who remained in Gloucester were gathered into another Church to take the place of the one removed. Nor is there evidence to the contrary. But first, no Church records of any sort were kept in Gloucester for sixty years, that is, not till about 1700. Secondly, the emigration of Mr. Blinman left those who remained in so feeble a state, on account of numbers and ability, that for several years they were unable to maintain preaching; and there was no stated preacher, and practically, no Church in Gloucester till 1661. There do not seem to have been people enough left, so inclined, to be gathered into a Church. But thirdly, the Church which did appear in Gloucester in 1661 has disappeared.

As we have seen, there is no record that this Church was formed under the laws of Connecticut; but we find evidences of its existence here very soon after 1651. There is no record of its organization at any date save 1642, nor at any place save Gloucester, at which time and place it was gathered by Rev.

Richard Blinman of those Welshmen who had followed their pastor from Chepstowe, because of their loyalty to him and to their Puritan principles. In Johnson's *Wonder-working Providence*, which is an account of events which transpired in the early history of New England, is a narrative of the "planting of the one and twentieth Church of Christ at a Town called Gloucester." The narrative is as follows: "There was another Town and Church of Christ erected in the Mattachusetts Government, upon the Northern Cape of the Bay, called Cape Ann, a place of fishing, being peopled with Fishermen, till the reverend Richard Blinman came from a place in Plimouth Patten, called Green Harbour, with some few people of his acquaintance, and settled down with them, named the Town Gloucester, and gathered into a Church, being but a small number, about fifty persons, they called to office this godly man." Here we have a statement of a contemporary, that the town and Church were constituted at the same time, as was the custom of those days, that the Church was the twenty-first in the order of formation, that it was originally composed of about fifty persons, and that Mr. Blinman was the pastor. John Winthrop was at that time Governor of Massachusetts, and he has fixed the year and month of the founding of this Church of Christ, and the town of Gloucester.

For in his History of New England, [p 64] speaking of "Mr. Blinman, a minister in Wales, a godly and able man," and of his coming first to Green Harbor, and then to Cape Ann, he says, "which at this court was established to be a plantation, and called Gloucester." This was the session of May, 1642, the records of which confirm what Winthrop says. May 13 is the date of the above entry in his journal. But the town and the Church were erected at the same time, according to Johnson's Wonder-working Providence. Then May, 1642, is the date of the organization of this Church.

Hon. Richard A. Wheeler says, [Papers of N. L. Hist. Soc. for 1891, p 19], Mr. Blinman's "old friends who had been with him at Plymouth and Green Harbor decided to go with him," to Pequot, "and share his fortunes. So they, the majority of the then Church of Gloucester, after disposing of their homesteads, followed Mr. Blinman to Pequot in the early spring of 1651. Mr. Blinman and Ralph Parker preceded them and came in the fall of 1650. So during the summer of 1651 Mr. Blinman, with his Gloucester Church friends and friends at New London assembled for worship at Mr. Robert Park's barn meeting house,

"And the sounding aisles of the dim woods rang
With their hymns of lofty cheer.

"So, beyond all controversy, when the majority

of the members of the Gloucester Church of 1642 under their regular installed pastor in unison with other Church members, assembled for public worship in New London in 1651, taken in connection with all the facts, precedent and subsequent thereto relating, is the time when the first Church of New London was established there." Mr. Wheeler also says that the facts confirm the view "that the Church organized in Gloucester, Mass., in 1642, with Richard Blinman as its pastor, removed to and was transplanted in New London in 1651."

Then this Church, in common with many of the historic churches of New England, is a fruit of that Puritanism which, from 1583 to 1660, shook England, in no small degree modified its social, political and religious life, marked the beginnings of religious freedom, and set in motion those movements which resulted in the planting of New England, and in the rise of this republic to a mighty nationality.

During the twenty-two years which had elapsed since the landing of the Pilgrims when this Church was organized, thirty Churches had been planted in Massachusetts, according to Dr. J. S. Clark. So that this was the thirty-first formed in that Colony, and not the twenty-first, as Johnson's Wonder-working Providence says. There had also been six Churches formed in Connecticut. So that this is

the thirty-seventh in New England. But several have become extinct, or ceased to be Congregational Churches, so that it stands much higher on the list. There are now but thirteen older Congregational Churches in Massachusetts, and but eight in Connecticut.

The nine oldest Churches in Connecticut, in the order of their age, are as follows: Windsor, organized in 1630; Hartford, first, organized in 1632; Wethersfield, organized in 1635; Stamford, organized in 1635; New Haven, first, organized in 1639; Milford, first, organized in 1639; Stratford, first, organized in 1639; Fairfield, organized in 1639; New London, first, organized in 1642.

The foregoing argument seems to leave no room to doubt the conclusion reached. The only link lacking in the chain is a record of the fact that those who were left in Gloucester after the departure of Mr. Blinman and his company, were gathered into another Church. But this lack is offset by the entire absence of ecclesiastical records in Gloucester before 1700, and by the fact that no other trace of the organization of this Church can be found. Certainly it was not gathered in Connecticut at any time before or after 1650-51. Else some notice of the fact would be found in the Colonial Records. We have, then, no hesitation in claiming May, 1642, as the date of its organization.

IV.

RICHARD BLINMAN'S PASTORATE.

MAY, 1642.—JANUARY, 1658.

We come now, in the history of the Church, to speak of the man who was its first pastor, and who, more than any other man, had a right to say, “I have laid the foundation.” He gave it the strong and stable character which has belonged to it from the first. That Richard Blinman was a man of strong and marked personality is proved by the fact that he was able to bring with him, from Chepstow to New London, by way of Marshfield and Gloucester, men of the stamp of Obadiah Bruen, Hugh Calkin, John Coit, Andrew Lester, James Avery and others like them.

He was probably born in Gloucester, England, early in the seventeenth, if not at the close of the sixteenth, century. We know that he died in Bristol, England, not far from 1683. He evidently came to this country in 1640. For in the records of the Plymouth Colony it appears that March 2, 1640, he, with Mr. Obadiah Bruen and others, was proposed

for the rights of freemen. Further, a letter from Edward Winslow to Governor Winthrop, of Boston, dated "Careswell, this 10th of 8th, 1640," says, "Mr. Blindman salutes you." In another letter, dated December 28 of the same year, Mr. Winslow writes, "and the more in regard of Mr. Blindman's friends that are come to live with us, and the straightness of the place to receive them." It seems settled then that he came to America early in 1640.

Mr. Blinman had been a curate in Chepstowe, Monmouthshire, England. Under Charles I. Archbishop Laud had virtually become first minister of the crown. His measures, as we have seen, were summary with the Puritans. With reckless and unscrupulous severity he drove Puritan ministers from English pulpits. As his hands grew heavier, the number of Puritan fugitives to New England increased. And it must be admitted that the impoverishment of Old England was the enrichment of New England.

Among the Puritan clergy, whose non-conformity had hitherto been winked at, but who were driven from their livings because they refused to wear the surplice, and make the sign of the cross, was Richard Blinman. Nothing was left for him but to join the Separatists, and become a Congregationalist.

He was invited to Marshfield by Mr. Edward

Winslow, who founded the Church in that place as early as 1639 or '40, says one authority, [Punchard's *Hist. Conglsm.*, vol. iv, p. 263], 1632, says another. [Clark's *Congregational Churches of Mass.*, p. 15]. In the records of the Plymouth Colony occurs the following, "this Church of Marshfield was begun, and afterward carried on by the help and assistance, under God, of Mr. Edward Winslow, who at the first procured several Welsh gentlemen of good note thither, with Mr. Blinman, a godly, able minister." Baylies' *History of New Plymouth* says, "Governor Winslow, the founder of Marshfield, often visited England; he induced several Welsh gentlemen of respectability to emigrate to America, amongst whom came the Rev. Richard Blinman, in 1642, who was the first pastor of the Church in Marshfield." Baylies is wrong in his dates. For Mr. Blinman was in Plymouth as early as March 2, 1640. The facts are that he came to America in 1640, at the solicitation of Edward Winslow, and that he was minister of the Church at Marshfield in 1642, the year in which he removed to Gloucester. Nor was he probably the first pastor of the Church. One Nehemiah Smyth seems to have been in charge before Mr. Blinman. For the Plymouth Colonial Records state that on March 3, 1639-40, there was granted "to Mr. Edward Winslow and the rest of the neighborhood of Green's

Harbor, a competent piece of upland and meadow for a farm for a minister ; and one other competent portion of land near unto said lot, for the minister ; either for Nehemiah Smyth, or some other, as the inhabitants of Green's Harbor shall place in.' ' [Punchard's *Hist. Conglsm.*, vol. iv, p. 263.]

It is not likely that Mr. Blinman was ever formally settled over the Marshfield Church, nor did he remain long in charge of its pulpit, for we find him in Gloucester, May 2, 1642. Lechford's *Plaine Dealing*, contemporary with Mr. Blinman, says: "Mr. Wilson [of Boston] did lately ride to Green Harbor in Plymouth Patent, to appease a broil between one Master Thomas, as I take it his name is, and Master Blinman when Master Blinman went by the worst." [Mass. *Hist. Coll.*, 3 series, vol. iii, p. 106.] The difficulties referred to seem to have related chiefly to the importance of an educated ministry, and to the question how far lay brethren should be allowed to exercise their gifts. Edward Winslow had been arraigned before Archbishop Laud to answer to the charge of preaching while he was a layman. The spirit of the founder of Marshfield seems to have been abroad there. In the collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society [vol. ix, p. 39, first series] occurs the following, which seems to refer to this controversy: "About the same time several ministers

came over to America, some with high raised expectations that the country was better cultivated than they found it, and that they could live here in as easy circumstances as among European settlements. They found themselves deceived. * * * Mr. Blinman, a gentleman from Wales, and a preacher of the gospel, was one who expected to find a welcome reception. Being invited to Green's Harbor, near Plymouth, he and his friends meant there to settle, but the influence of a few gifted brethren made learning or prudence of little avail. They compared him to 'a piece of new cloth in an old garment,' and thought that they could do better without patching. The old and new planters, to speak a more modern style, could not agree and parted." This controversy leaves no room to doubt that Mr. Blinman was an educated man, probably trained to the ministry in one of the English schools. It is clear, too, that he left the pulpit in Marshfield, because the pews wanted to get into it. The year of his assuming the pulpit in Marshfield, 1642, was the year of his relinquishing it, and of his departure for Gloucester. For Governor Winthrop, of Boston, says in his diary, "One Mr. Blinman, a minister in Wales, a godly and able man, came over with some friends of his, and being invited to Green's Harbor, near Plymouth, they went, but ere the year was expired there fell out some differ-

ence among them which could by no means be reconciled, so they agreed to part, and he came with his company and sat down at Cape Ann, which at this court [May, 1642,] was established to be a plantation, and called Gloucester." A note in the Mather papers says that the town was called Gloucester after the city and shire in England where some of Mr. Blinman's companions (and it may be Mr. Blinman himself) were born. The ability and godliness of Mr. Blinman's character are thus witnessed to by Governor Winthrop; and that he was a man of peace is proved by his leaving Marshfield rather than abide in a controversy. Before we are through with his life, we shall find other instances in which he exhibited the same irenic qualities. It is also to be remembered, as testifying to his worth and excellence, that those who had followed him from England, who had been with him in the persecutions which drove him from it, and who had witnessed his bearing through all that he endured for the sake of the gospel, followed him from Marshfield to Gloucester.

Then in 1642 Mr. Blinman, with his Welsh friends settled in Gloucester, Mass. They, with a few fishermen already on the ground, were gathered into a Church, with Mr. Blinman as their pastor, as we have found. An item in Johnson's *Wonder-working Providence*, speaking of the formation of the Church, says

that "they called to office this godly reverend man, whose gifts and ability to handle the Word is not inferior to many others, laboring much against the errors of the times, of a sweet, humble, heavenly carriage." [Mass. Hist. Coll., 2d series, vol. vii, p. 32.] This is contemporary testimony to the worth, ability and godliness of character of the first pastor of this Church.

Several of Mr. Blinman's friends were elected, May 2, 1642, to manage affairs in the new plantation of Gloucester. Among them were Mr. Obadiah Bruen, who was chosen town recorder, and held the office till he removed to New London; Mr. William Addes, who came to Pequot about 1659, "when he was allowed to brew beer and distil for the benefit of the town;" Walter Tybbot, who had followed Mr. Blinman from England, and five others. These men were appointed magistrates by the commissioners of the General Court, who were Mr. Endicott, the deputy governor, Mr. Emmanuel Downing, uncle of John Winthrop, Jr., and Mr. Hathorne, from Salem.

This Mr. Downing had been a lawyer of the Inner Temple in London, and had come to New England in 1638. He had married Lucy, the sister of Governor Winthrop, of Boston. February 23, 1650, Lucy Downing wrote to John Winthrop, Jr., her nephew, who was then at Pequot, sending her "service" to

Mr. Blinman. December 24, 1650, Mr. Downing wrote to the same John Winthrop, Jr., speaking in a similar way of Mr. Blinman. Early in November, 1650, Mr. Blinman's name is mentioned in the records of a town meeting in Pequot. Miss Caulkins speaks of this as the first notice of his arrival in New London. But October 19, 1650, there was voted a grant of land to him and several others who were of the Cape Ann Colony. It seems then that early in 1650, Mr. Blinman was in New London, probably to consider a proposition to remove from Gloucester. Mr. Obadiah Bruen seems to have accompanied him on his first visit. In view of his final decision to accept the invitation, the town, in October, voted to him, and several others who were to come with him, grants of land, mostly on what is now Granite street where was Mr. Blinman's house lot, and on what was then known as "New street, but to which afterwards they gave the name Cape Ann lane—an historic appellation which has significance as connected with the history of New London.

As to the reasons for his leaving Gloucester, the history of that town says "unhappy dissensions drove Mr. Blinman from the scene of his first ministry in New England [Marshfield], and the ill treatment he received from some of his people here [Gloucester] may have hastened, if it did not induce, his departure

from the town. His Church was defamed; his public meetings were disturbed; and he himself was scoffingly spoken of for what he had formerly delivered in the way of the ministry.” One of these disturbers was arrested and fined fifty shillings at court, August 27, 1644. He probably received this treatment in return for “laboring much against the errors of the times.” Too plain preaching was not any more acceptable to those who needed it then than it is now. Lechford’s *Plaine Dealing*, which gives the contemporary “newes of New England,” speaking of Mr. Blinman’s coming to this Colony, asks, “Was not Master K. sent away, or compounded with, to seek a new place at Long Island * * * and Master Bleindman to Connecticot?”

The original contract with Mr. Blinman, if it ever had an existence, is lost. But from subsequent references it appears that a committee was sent to Gloucester, by the town, to confer with him, and that they pledged him liberal donations of land, with a salary of £60 a year, which was to be increased “as the ability of the town increased.” The donations of land were liberally made. He owned a farm at the Harbor’s Mouth, which he sold, on removing from town, to John Tinker; he had grants of land on “the General Neck, and at Upper Mamacock,” which he sold to James Rogers; he had farms at Pine

Neck and Fort Hill, which were unsold when he left the country; he also had a large grant of land in Mystic; there were also other grants made, so that this part of the town's agreement was executed in a most liberal manner.

It will be interesting to note here that, quite frequently, the colonial parson was a farmer as well as a preacher, and thus added to his income which was often somewhat limited. Some of those early divines were model agriculturists. In old England the clergyman rented his lands, but the New England parson derived income from his by cultivating them. Sometimes the revenue was quite considerable, and added materially to his means of support. Mr. Child says, "one faithful parson was severely handled by his people because he made some eight hundred dollars by selling produce from his land." The liberal allotments of land voted to Mr. Blinman were in keeping with the customs of those early times. How extensively Mr. Blinman cultivated his numerous acres we do not know.

December 20, 1650, a house lot of six acres was confirmed to him on Meeting House Hill, "three acres whereof," says the record, "were given by the town's agents, as appears in the articles, and the other three by a public town meeting." This lot was bounded by the town's Antientest Buriall Place on

the east, by Williams street on the west, and by Granite street on the south. The northern boundary ran so as to include six acres. In addition to these grants of land, and the £60 annual stipend, the town, as appears from various records, built a house for him on the lot just described. On what part of this lot the house stood is not known, but a reasonable supposition would seem to be that it was not far from the dwelling of the late William H. Barns. The conjecture of Miss Caulkins that it stood opposite the lot of Richard Post, on Post Hill does not seem correct, for that would place it north of the north line of the six acres granted to Mr. Blinman on Meeting House Hill. "He had another lot in the lower part of the town near the cove, where Blinman street perpetuates his name." In 1653 he removed to this lot. His house stood where the old bridge crossed the cove. [Miss Caulkins.] It is supposed that he lived here during the remainder of his residence in New London.

We may pause a moment to note that when Mr. Blinman came here, he was not only followed by his friends, but was in a measure surrounded by them. On the east was the lot of Obadiah Bruen, lying between the town square, or Meeting House Green, as it was then called, and Broad street, east of Hempstead street. On the corner of Hempstead and Gran-

ite streets was the residence of Robert Park, whose son Thomas married the sister of Mrs. Blinman. Not far away, across Truman brook, were settled several other families who had shared the fortunes of their pastor since he had been driven from his parish in Chepstowe. He was settled among his friends, and lived near to the spot whereon was to stand the meeting house.

The History of Gloucester gives the names of some of the chief people who came with Mr. Blinman. “The emigrants to New London were Christopher Avery, James Avery, William Addes, William Kenie, Andrew Lister, William Meades, Ralph Parker, William Wellman, Obadiah Bruen, Hugh Caulkin, John Coit, Sen., and William Hough.” [p. 52.] These men, who had been prominent in town and in Church in Gloucester, took leading places in the Pequot Colony. They were farmers and mechanics. To quote Miss Caulkins, “On that billowy mass of rocks, that promontory so singularly bold in position and outline (Cape Ann), and so picturesque in appearance, they fixed their second encampment in this new world.” They hoped here, in the Pequot Colony, to find a less sterile soil. “It was certainly an object for the faithful pastor and his tried friends to keep together, and as Pequot was without a minister, and casting about to obtain one, the arrangement was an

agreeable one on both sides." Not only the twenty families which came with, or soon after Mr. Blinman, but also those which followed still later, helped to swell the population of the Colony to over forty families. [Trumbull.] Early in 1651, as we have seen, a street was opened for them "in the rear of the town," which came to be known as Cape Ann lane. It was designated as "beyond the brook, and the ministry lot." The brook still runs into the sea. Meeting House Hill is where it was when the First Church, and its minister's house stood on it. The street which once bore the historic name Cape Ann lane, still winds its way at the foot of the rolling ground beyond. The Church remains of which Richard Blinman was the first pastor. The ancient cemetery is where it was when he committed the sainted dead to their last rest, "earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust."

Not much is known about the ministry of Mr. Blinman in New London. It continued here about seven years, and ended because he ended it. He seems to have been a man of kind disposition, as is shown by the correspondence which he kept up with the friends, whom he left behind. February 25, 1653, this minute was entered on the town records: "Forasmuch as the town was ingaged to Mr. Blynman for a set stypend and soe to increase it yeerly Mr.

Blynman is freely willing to free the towne hence-forward from that ingadgement." This is among the proofs that he was actuated by no mercenary spirit.

At a meeting of the town, September 20, 1651, two or three items of business were "to propound the bying of Mr. Park's barn," which, as will be seen, was used for a meeting house; "a rate for Mr. Blynman's half yeer;" "speak about new drum," to call people together for divine service. In October of that year, the question of a new meeting house was before the town, for one of the items of business was "a rate for the new meeting house," which had been decided upon already.

When Mr. Blinman came, in 1650, there was a Meeting House Hill, but there was no meeting house on it. During the first years of his ministry he preached in the barn meeting house, which stood on the spot now occupied by the residence of the late Mr. George E. Whittlesey. It belonged to Robert Park. August 29, 1651, the following vote of the town is recorded: "For Mr. Parke's barne the Towne doe agree for the use of it until mid-summer next, to give him a day's work a peace for a meeting house, to be redy by the Saboth come amoneth." "Mem. Mr. Parke is willing to accept of 3 l." From this vote it appears that worship began in the barn

meeting house October 1, 1651. It is probable that previous to this, divine service was held in some private dwelling, as was often done in those early days.

In 1652 Mr. Park sold his house lot to Mr. William Rogers, from Boston. June 30 of that year is a record of an agreement on the part of the town with Mr. Rogers for the use of the barn for purposes of worship, for two years from date, at the same rate; that is, "for the summe of 3 l. per annum." If the town "build a leantoo, he is to allow for it in the rent, and if it come to more he is to allow it, and for flooring and what charges the town is at, he is willing to allow when the time is expired." The town continued to worship in the barn meeting house till 1655. The sequel to the story of this unique house of worship was that, in 1672-3, the town was called upon to pay rent in arrears, which the heirs of William Rogers declared had never been paid. February 27, 1672-3, the town voted "upon demand made by Hugh Caulkin," who had meanwhile removed to Norwich, who had been the town's surety for payment of the rent seventeen years before, and upon whom the heirs had served a writ for £3 10s. "for money due to Mr. Leake, of Boston, for improvement of a barn of Goodman Rogers, which said Caulkins stood engaged for to pay, this town doth promise to pay one barrel

of pork some time next winter." Whether the promise was kept we are not told. It is to be presumed, however, that it was, and that the rent of the first place of worship, occupied by this Church, was discharged by a commodity which a Jew would have declined to receive.

The first public action looking toward the erection of a meeting house for public worship seems to have been taken August 29, 1651, when the following entry was made on the town records: "Goodman Elderkin doth undertake to build a meeting house about the same demention of Mr. Parke's his barne, and clapboard it for the sume of eight pounds, provided the towne cary the tymber to the place and finde nales. And for his pay he requires a cow and 50s. in peage," or toll. A further vote is recorded December 16, 1652, levying a rate of £14 to build a new meeting house, and fixing upon the site. Mr. Bruen made the following entry upon the town's records: "The place for the new meeting house was concluded on by the meeting to be in the highwaie, taking a corner of my lot to supply the highwaie." This was the area now known as Bulkeley Place. Captain Denison and Lieutenant Smith were the building committee. As they were discharged in February, 1655, it seems probable that the new meeting house was completed about that time. It



AVERY HOUSE—Front View.
The left portion is the Blinnman Meeting House, the first built in New London.

must have stood contiguous to the old burial ground, on the south side of it. Its tower was doubtless the lookout for the town watchman. "From the gallery windows the eye commanded a fine expanse of country, and could mark every sail that went up or down the Sound." The ground was high, and the church tower commanded a wide outlook.

No Sabbath bell announced the hour of divine service in those early days. People were summoned to public worship by the beat of a drum. March 22, 1651-2, this vote is recorded: "The towne have agreed with Peter Blatchford to beat the drum all Saboth dayes, training dayes, and town publique meetings for the sum of 3 lb., to be paid him in a towne rate." He continued to exercise these functions for several years, and the hosts of the Lord were rallied by drumbeat on the Lord's day, till about 1675, when mention of such service ceases. The religion of those days—as, indeed, it is of all days—was more or less a conflict. I do not think that it was ever true of the founders of New London, if it was of any of the early Puritans, that "they first fell on their knees, and then upon the aborigines." But it often happened, in those primitive days, that men were obliged to go to church armed, for fear of surprise by the aborigines. Near by the barn meeting house, on still higher ground, probably on the spot

now occupied by the residence of Captain James F. Smith, in the days before the meeting house, was stationed the watch, to give alarm if enemies should appear. The beat of the drum, therefore, was not an inapt method of calling the people together to attend public worship, as their life was a conflict with foes without as well as with foes within.

The lot north of the meeting house was first used for burial in 1652, but was set apart for such purposes June 6, 1653, by vote of the town. This vote has never been rescinded. It is one of the oldest cemeteries in New England, and is rich in historic associations, and rich in the men and women whose dust reposes in it, who had to do with the founding of the town, who were great in their day and generation, and whose hands helped to lay the foundations, build the superstructure, and defend it; colonial and revolutionary heroes, who shed their blood for their country.

March 26, 1655, soon after the probable completion of the new meeting house, "Goodman Chapman" was "chosen to be grave-maker for the town," and it was agreed that he should "have 4s. for men and women's graves, and for all children's graves 3s. for every grave he makes." "February 25, 1661-2," the records read, "old Goodman Cumstock is chosen sexton, whose work is to order youth in the meeting

house" (that is, act as tithingman), "sweep the meeting house, and beat out dogs, for which he is to receive 40s. a year; he is also to make all graves; for a man or a woman he is to have 4s., for children 2s. a grave, to be paid by *survivors*." "From which enumeration of his powers," says Hon. Augustus Brandegee, "it may fairly be inferred that in the early days men and women were upon the same level, youth were as mischievous, and dogs as much a nuisance as in these modern times." And it may also be added that it was thoughtful on the part of the town to lay the expense of burial upon the survivors rather than upon the dead.

Mr. Blinman preached about three years and a half in the barn meeting house, and then about three years in the first house built expressly for public worship in New London. This house was occupied as a place of worship till about 1682. [Caulkins, p. 192.] This first, or Blinman, meeting house was purchased by James Avery in 1684, and was moved to Poquonnock Plain, where he added it to the house which he had built in 1656. It stood till July 20, 1894, when it was destroyed by fire. It was occupied by the descendants of James Avery till the day it was burned, and the occupant at that time was James D. Avery.

Rev. John Avery, recently pastor of the Church in Ledyard, a descendant of James Avery, says "the old Avery mansion at Poquonnock was built by Captain James Avery in 1656. The old Blinman church edifice in New London was sold in June, 1684, to Captain James Avery, with the condition that he should remove it in one month's time. This he did, and added it to his house at Poquonnock. A hundred years later the house was occupied by Elder Park Avery, a Separate minister, a great-grandson of Captain James Avery. Elder Park Avery had a large room fitted up in the house for public worship, and there he and the Church which he gathered held public service for a great many years." This probably was the last use of the old Blinman meeting house for public worship.

Mr. Blinman's pastorate in New London seems to have been acceptable and harmonious, save the misunderstanding with Thomas Miner and Captain Denison, of which particulars will be given. Dr. Field says "it is not known for what reason he was dismissed from his charge in this place. There is no evidence that there was any dissatisfaction with his ministration. On the contrary he seems to have been highly esteemed, and very successful in his work." [Bi-Centennial Address, p. 10.] He was clearly a man of great force of character. That he was a fear-

less preacher is proved by the opposition which his preaching provoked, and by the fact, testified to by a contemporary, that he labored "much against the errors of the times." He was held in high esteem by the eminent men of his day—men like John Winthrop, Emmanuel Downing, and Increase Mather.

During his ministry here he was sent by the General Court, with others, to represent the Colony in the discussion of certain grave questions, at a convention held in Boston. The vote of the General Court, passed February 26, 1657, was as follows: "This Court doth order that Mr. Warham [of Windsor], Mr. Stone [of Hartford], Mr. Blinman [of New London], and Mr. Russell [of Weathersfield] bee desired to meet the first fifth day of June next at Boston, to confer and debate the questions formerly sent to the Bay Court, or any other of the like nature that shall be propounded to them by that Court or our own, with such divines as shall be sent to said meeting from the other Colonies." The questions to be debated, and concerning which Connecticut had asked the advice of the other Colonies, were theological, and related chiefly to the practice of baptism under the Half-way Covenant, as it was known, which had begun to be practiced at Hartford, after the death of Mr. Hooker. A strong party had grown up in the Colony, who were disposed to grant certain

Church privileges to persons of exemplary deportment, without requiring them to give evidence of a change of heart. This came to be known as the "Parish Way," which was old in the old country, but new in the new. Differences of opinion upon these questions grew so marked and decided, that the peace of the Churches was threatened. Their spiritual life declined. Grievances were presented to the General Court. This body sought the advice of the other Colonies. Massachusetts joined in the request. Seventeen questions were proposed; Dr. Bacon says twenty-one, and Dr. Dunning twenty-four. June 4, 1657, the Council met in Boston. How Mr. Blinman stood upon these questions we have no positive means of knowing. One of his associates, Mr. Stone, of Hartford, favored and practiced the Half-way Covenant. Mr. Russell and Mr. Warham did not. There are reasons for believing that Mr. Blinman did not. But the point which I desire to emphasize is, that his choice by the legislature to represent the Churches of the Colony upon matters so vitally touching their life, testifies to his ability, and to the prominent place which he held among the ministers of Connecticut and of New England.

He always avoided controversy and strove to promote peace. It is said that he once tore up a writ which had been taken out against another person, in

order to stop proceedings, so that the matter might be privately settled. When arraigned before the Court he acknowledged the offence, and, because he did not tear up the writ in contempt of authority, he was let off with the admonition "to beware of like rash carriage for time to come." Aside from Marshfield and Gloucester, "he appears to have worked undisturbed in the other fields of labor, and to have lived in peaceful and harmonious relations with all." The following lines, written while he was still in Gloucester, give a contemporary's estimate of his character:

Thou hast thy prime and middle age here spent :
The best is not too good for him that gave it.
When thou did'st first this wilderness frequent,
For Sion's sake it was, that Christ might save it.
Blindman be blith in him, who thee hath taken
To feed his flock, a few poor scattered sheep.
Why should they be of thee at all forsaken ?
Thy honor's high, that any thou may'st keep.
Wait patiently thy master's coming : thou
Hast hitherto his people's portion dealt.
It matters not for high preferment : now
Thy crown's to come, with joyes immortal felt.

If these lines are read in view of his contemplated departure from Gloucester, they shed a pleasant light upon the worthy character of the first pastor of this venerable Church.

As late as 1657 the parish of the first Church comprised the whole territory from Nahantick on the

east to Nahantick on the west. Till that year the minister's rates were levied over that whole tract. Mr. Blinman was accustomed to hold occasional services in Mystic and Pawcatuck, for the benefit of his parishioners in these remote districts. He owned a considerable tract of land at Mystic. It was in this connection that the only trouble arose which in the least disturbed the harmony of his pastorate here. Hon. Richard A. Wheeler says [Centennial celebration of First Church, Stonington] "up to 1654-5 the planters here attended meeting at New London when the weather permitted, and paid their rates for the support of the ministry there; but the distance was so great, with two rivers to pass in going and coming, that they were anxious to have public religious worship established among themselves." To do this they were obliged to obtain a grant for a new town from the General Court. This was opposed by those who lived west of Mystic River. At first Mr. Blinman favored the project, but afterwards opposed it. Hot words passed between him and Thomas Miner and Captain Denison. They accused him of playing a double part. Captain Denison said "that Mr. Blinman did preach for Pawcatuck and Mystic being a town before he sold his land at Mystic;" implying that after he sold his land, his personal interests changed. While the controversy was at its height, a

town meeting was held at Pequot, August 28, 1654, at which four men were appointed from Pequot, and three from Mystic and Pawcatuck, "to debate, reason and conclude whether Mystic and Pawcatuck should be a town, and upon what terms, and to determine the case in no other way, but in the way of reason and love, and not by vote." The committee failed to agree. In 1656 the General Court passed the following order: "It is ordered by this Court, that while the ministry is maintained at Pawcatuck, the charge thereof and of the ministry at Pequett shall be borne as the major part of the inhabitants shall agree or order, that is whether Pawcatuck shall by and of themselves maintaine their minister, or whether they shall maintaine both their ministers in a joynt way." The majority decided that the settlers at Pawcatuck should pay their rates to Mr. Blinman, and appealed to the General Court to enforce their payment. At the session of May, 1657, the following vote was passed: "This Court doth order that the inhabitants of Mistick and Paucatuck shall pay to Mr. Blinman that which was to him for last yeare, scil: to March last." [Col. Rec., 1636-1665, p. 300.] The following entry in the diary of Thomas Miner shows that Mr. Blinman was paid for services in Pawcatuck: "May 22, 1654, I paid Mr. Blinman one firkin of butter and 12d. in wampum, which made

his whole year's pay." A committee was appointed by the legislature in May, 1657, consisting of Mr. Winthrop, Major Mason, Captain Callick and Mr. Allyn, to bring to an issue the dispute between the inhabitants of Pequot, Mystic and Pawcatuck. This committee met at Pequot, July 8, 1657. What they said or did is not known, but whatever their action, it only intensified the controversy. "Mr. Blinman's rates were not paid, and he gave up his occasional services at Mystic and Pawcatuck." [Hon. Richard A. Wheeler.] We have already recorded the reconciliation between Thomas Miner and Mr. Blinman, at the meeting of the Church held August 28, 1654. At the May session of the General Court for 1657, it is recorded in the doings of that body, that "Captain Denison doth acknowledge in this Court that hee wronged Mr. Blinman and missed his rule, and that he spake corruptly in saying that Mr. Blinman did preach for Paucatuck and Mystick being a Towne, before hee sold his land at Mystick as aforesaid." In the year 1658 it was decided by commissioners of the united Colonies that the territory hitherto comprising one plantation, should be divided into two, with the Mystic river for the dividing line, and that Mystic and Pawcatuck should be under the jurisdiction of Massachusetts, whose General Court incorporated the territory into a township which it named Southerton.

Thus the unhappy differences which had estranged the people of these two sections from each other, were finally settled.

Mr. Blinman was accustomed to preach to the Indians in his parish. A letter written by Thomas Allen, of Norwich, England, and dated the eighth day of the eleventh month of 1651, says concerning the progress of the gospel among the Indians: "I can testify * * * being lately come over from New England, that there are divers persons in severall places who doe take pains, and labor in that work there, viz., not onely Mr. Eliot, of Roxbury, * * * and Mr. Mayhew * * * at an Island called Martin's Vineyard, but also Mr. Leveridge in the jurisdiction of Plymouth, and Mr. Blynman who lives now in a new Plantation in the Pequotts Country." [Mass. Hist. Coll., 3d series, vol. iv, p. 194.] It is stated that in 1657 the agents of the Society for Propagating the Gospel in New England proposed to him to become a missionary to the Pequots and Mohegans at a salary of £20 a year, and pay for an interpreter. He declined. But neither his declination nor the division of the plantation just spoken of, deprived either the Indians or the English people residing in Mystic and Pawcatuck from the privileges of the Gospel. For in 1657 Mr. Thomson came as a missionary to the Indians, at a salary of £10 for the

first year and £20 for the second year. His meetings were attended by the English as well as by the Indians. Thomas Miner wrote in his diary under date of June 12, 1659, "Mr. Tomson taught at mr. Burrows. mr. Winthrop was there."

As showing Mr. Blinman's appreciation of Mr. Thomson, the Indian missionary, it will be of interest to read the following letter, written from New Haven the year after Mr. Blinman left New London:

"LOVING FRIEND MR. THOMSON:

"I was bold by brother Parkes formerly to tender a small gift to you, viz., a piece of land and swamp which was given me for a wood lot, lying towards the west side of William Cumstock's hill, which if you please to accept as a token of my love I do give and confirm it to you. Your loving friend,

"RICHARD BLINMAN.

"New Haven, April 11, 1659."

The 20th "of January [1657-8] being Wednesday, Mr. Blinman gave notis that he would be gone," says the diary of Thomas Miner. January 29 he records that Mr. Blinman went to New Haven during that week. No reason appears. I am inclined to the opinion that the practice of the Half-way Covenant by the churches in the Colony had something to do with his summary departure. He resided there a little over a year, returning to New London to complete some business before embarking with his family for England, which he did shortly after.

After a residence in America of twenty years, he

returned to England by way of Newfoundland, sailing July 27 or 28, 1659. Under date of July 8 of that year Thomas Miner wrote in his diary, "Friday the 8 Mr. Blinman was at Towne." Two days later he wrote, "the 10th," which was Sunday, "mr. Blinman taught at London." This was, doubtless, his farewell service in this town and in this country. He preached for some time in Newfoundland with great acceptance, and received an urgent call to settle there, which he declined. Rev. John Davenport wrote to John Winthrop, Jr., September 28, 1659, "and to let you know that I have received a letter from Mr. Blinman dated August 22 [1659], whereby I understand that God hath brought him to his Newfoundland, in safety and health, and maketh his ministry acceptable to all the people there except some Quakers, and much desired and flocked unto, and hath made choice of a ship for Barnstaple, to his content the master being godly." [Mass. Hist. Coll., third series, vol. x, p. 25.] Here we have incidental testimony to his power and ability as a preacher. He arrived in England some time in 1660, and took up his abode in Bristol, where Savage says "he continued in the service." Two of his farms, at Pine Neck, and Fort Hill, were purchased by Christopher Christophers after he left the country, and the deed of conveyance reads: "I, Richard

Blinman, with Mary my wife, now dwelling in the castle, in the city of Bristol, England, 10 Jan. 1670-1." We know from this, and from letters dated at Bristol as late as 1679, that after his return to England, he lived and probably died, in that city.

He was a learned and an able man. This is the testimony of contemporaries. He was a Puritan of the straightest sect, and uncompromisingly opposed to ecclesiastical hierarchy, and to everything in Church order which had in it the least suspicion of hierarchy. He was an outspoken Non-conformist; and for this reason lost his charge in Chepstow. He seems to have been among the last to seek an asylum in New England from the tyranny of Charles I. and of Laud. For events soon ripened into the death of the King, the ascendancy of Puritanism in England, and the Lord Protectorate of Cromwell. He was an able expounder of the Word of God. Shortly before his death he wrote a treatise on infant baptism.

The only writings of his which have come under our eye are a few of his letters to Rev. Increase Mather, "Teacher to the Second Church at Boston in New England." These reveal the man quite as much as sermons could do. April 12, 1677, he wrote from Bristol, where all his letters to Mr. Mather are dated, "since my former by this bearer, I have heard something that I cannot omit. The convoca-

tion summoned by the prelates' procurement, who went up with high expectations of straitning the Non-conformists, and providing for themselves had no commission given them to convene when they came up. I can not but looke upon it as an answer to prayers, which calls for prayses." In a postscript he adds, "this post seems to lessen the great victory of the French over the Prince of Orange and his army," referring probably to the defeat of the Prince of Orange at Cassel, which stirred the whole country to a cry for war to check French aggression.

August 14, 1677, he writes again to Mr. Mather, as follows: "I, with many others, are grieved to hear, that so little reformation hath been wrought by the awful dispensation of God to New England, and doe feare what wilbe the yssue of them. But the Lord hath a people among you, whom I trust he wil never leave nor forsake." He probably speaks of the threatened loss of the Bay Charter, and adds, "God hath formerly often blasted such endeavors, and I hope, will doe so stil, it being a thing wherein his glory is so much concerned. The Lord give a mighty spirit of supplication, humiliation and Repentance to his own people amongst you." In this letter he alludes to the imprisonment of Shaftsbury, Buckingham, Salisbury and Wharton, whom Danby had caused to be confined in the Tower in 1677 on

charge of contempt of the House of Commons. Alluding to failure of harvest because of excessive rains, he goes on to say, “and our misery and sin is, that it’s laid to heart by very few. The Lord seems to say, the floure and wine-press shal not feed us, & that he will take away our corn in the season thereof. We are making mirth, even now when God hath fourbished his sword against us. Cursed plays, by which the nation is debauched, abound, which our city experienced now at James’s fayer.” [St. James’s Fair, which began on the eve of St. James’s Day, July 25.]

Under date of March, or April 8, 1678, he writes again: “We have nothing but rumors of warrs against the French. * * * Our late news is, that the French have deserted their present designe at Mycena in Sicily; & hath laid an embargo on all his [Charles’s] vessels in France, and made an order against our English commodities, in imitation of what we have done against French commodities here, & on our ships here. On Thursday next our Parliament, after a fortnight’s adjournment, is to sit againe; the day before which there is to be a day of humiliation in all London; and that day fortnight over all England, to be seriously kept by all subjects, according to the printed form of prayer that shalbe prescribed. This post we heare that the French Mon-

sieur hath deserted Ghent and Ypres ; which maks some think we shal indeed have war with France." This letter closes with reference to efforts to bring some of the Scotch to terms. The allusion to threatened war with France is a reference to a warlike speech from the throne to the Parliament of 1678, in answer to which supplies were voted and an army raised. But the actual declaration never came. Charles simply turned Danby's threats to his own benefit. [Green pp. 630, 631].

Under date of May 20, 1678, after alluding to some political matters, and to a protest of the Scotch nobility against the rigorous dealings of Lauderdale, whose iron rule in Scotland had had, for one of its purposes the humbling of the Scotch Presbyterians [Green p. 616] Mr. Blinman writes : "I could not omit to give you the estate of our present affaiers, since my former. You see what need we have of prayers. Its thought some great shaking is neere. I believe that earthquake, Revelation 11th, is not far off, when the 7,000 names of men (who are indeed rather bruits than men) shalbe slain, and the remainder (or rest of men) shal have their eyes opened, be affrighted and give glory to God. And then woe be to Rome."

August 9, 1678, he writes again, in which he narrates some of the events connected with the French

and Dutch war ; gives a current rumor that eight French men of war and six French merchantmen with 9,500 men were lost by a hurricane in the West Indies, which he calls “ an eminent blast of God, if true ; ” and says that “ the Scots stil goe on with their meetings, notwithstanding all the cruelties they have met with, & its said, they increase, & many come in to them, who before stood off.” He also speaks of the treaty of Nimeguen, which, says Green, “ not only left France the arbiter of Europe, but it left Charles the master of a force of twenty thousand men levied for the war he refused to declare, and with nearly a million of French money in his pocket.” Mr. Blinman adds: “ You see our state, & I suppose you know your own better than I can tell you. Yet I shal adventure to give you this hint, under the Rose, that I feare an Inhabitant of your countrey would faine be Lord paramount over all the Colonies.” To whom the writer refers in the last sentence we do not know. Various attempts of that kind were made by men who were ambitious of large powers.

These letters were written in the tumultuous times of Charles II. They breathe the intense religious spirit of the men who, in those days, dissented from the established ecclesiastical order. There can be no mistaking the opinions of their author. The Puritanism for whose sake he had quitted England almost

forty years before, had lost, in the lapse of time, nothing of its strong hold upon him. He was keenly alive to the public questions which agitated his day. He was a believer in the Lord's second personal coming. He was a man of strong convictions, which he was not afraid to express, so as not to be misunderstood. He devoutly recognized the hand of God in the startling events of the times. His early non-conformity had ripened into pronounced Separatism. He was a strong man. He must have left the impress of his spirit on the Church which he gathered. A man who is willing to suffer expatriation for the sake of his convictions cannot be weak. Not very much is known of the details of his life here. But the work which he did abides in the Church whose foundations he laid so deep and so well in eternal truth, that they have stood stable and strong through all the changes and vicissitudes and social upheavals of over two centuries and a half.

His children, were Jeremiah, born July 20, 1642; Ezekiel, born November 10, 1643; Azarikam, born January 2, 1646. These were all born in Gloucester. Jeremiah remained in this country.

Dr. Trumbull says "he lived to a good old age, and at the city of Bristol happily concluded a life spent in doing good." The date of his death and his age we do not know. Rev. John Bishop, writing to

Increase Mather from Stamford, August 12, 1679, speaks of letters received from Mr. Blinman, [Mass. Hist. Coll., 4th series, vol. viii, p. 307] as if he were then alive. Thomas Miner, in his diary for May 23, 1683, wrote, "Was at New London * * * gave my testimony concerning Mr. Blindman's letter that he had received his pay from Mr. Christophers" for the farms on Pine Neck and Fort Hill. This is the last trace of him which we can find. We may conclude, therefore, that his death took place between 1679 and 1683. He was in his prime when he came to America. His first child was born in Gloucester. His marriage had not taken place long before; probably after his arrival in 1640. Then his age at the time of his death must have been about eighty years. If no other monument to his memory exists, the Church which he gathered, and founded upon Christ, as the chief corner-stone, is a fitting one.

V.

GERSHOM BULKELEY'S PASTORATE.

1661—1665.

After the departure of Mr. Blinman the Church seems to have addressed itself immediately to the task of securing his successor. For June 17, 1658, Thomas Miner records in his diary, "thursday the 17 Captaine denison, Mr. stanton, goodman cheesesborough was heare to bid me com to a meeting;" presumably a meeting called with reference to securing a minister. For five days later he records, "Tuesday the 22 James morgan was to go to the Bay for A minister." This must have been an attempt to secure the Rev. Antipas Newman, of Wenham, who married Elizabeth, the eldest daughter of Governor John Winthrop, Jr. For the Governor wrote to his son, Fitz-John, September 9, 1658, as follows: "The Plantation of Pequot, which is now called New London (that name being established by order of the General Court), hath beene very earnest with him to be there, Mr. Blinman having left them, who is at present settled at New Haven, and like to continue

there. He lives in Mr. Hookes house there. Those people at New London have beene very earnest to have Mr. Newman, but the other of Wenham are not willing to heare of his removal from them." So the effort to secure him did not succeed. The attention of the Church was probably turned to Mr. Newman by the fact that he had preached for them with very great acceptance in 1657 while Mr. Blinman was absent at the Synod, held that year in Boston. Thus Jonathan Brewster wrote to Governor Winthrop from "Pequett," under date of June 28, 1657, "Mr. Blyndman is not returned from the assembly of elders. Young Mr. Newman supplied his place in the ministry, a man very hopeful, and, indeed, beyond expectation did wonderfully satisfy the spirits of his hearers."

Three years intervened between the departure of Mr. Blinman and the coming of Mr. Bulkeley. How religious services were maintained we are not told. In January, 1659-60, Thomas Miner makes these entries in his diary: "Sabath day 22 we had no meeting." "Sabath day the 29 Capt. Denison did exercise." The captain had performed the same service before. For October 19, 1656, he records that "Captaine denison taught." These were doubtless what were called in the olden times "deacons' meetings." Though whether this Denison was a

deacon we do not know. Besides it is supposed that John Tinker, a man of prominence and gifts in the town, often conducted public worship during the interval. For an item of business transacted at town meeting, December 1, 1661, was "to know what allowance Mr. Tinker shall have for his tyme spent in exercising in public." As Mr. Bulkeley had at that time begun his stated ministrations, it seems likely that Mr. Tinker had often exercised in public at religious meetings on the Sabbath, until the arrival of the new minister. He received for these services six pounds. "He was rate-maker, collector and commissioner for the year 1662, and also an assistant of the Colony." He was chosen, with James Morgan and Obadiah Bruen, "to seat the people in the meeting house, which, they doing, the inhabitants are to rest silent." This vote seems to point to some openly expressed dissatisfaction which was thus summarily rebuked. Mr. Tinker was popular with the people, insomuch that charges of treason which were brought against him found little favor with the public. He died at Hartford, while awaiting trial upon these charges, and was honored with a funeral at public expense. He was licensed to distil and retail liquors, and had, from the General Court, a monopoly of the business, with power to arrest any who should infringe on his rights and privileges. If it seems

strange to us that such a man should conduct religious services, it is to be remembered that public sentiment upon such questions has very decidedly changed since those times.

Before proceeding to the narrative of Mr. Bulkeley's ministry, we will note one or two facts, which show the relation in which the Church stood to the town at that time, and for about eighty years afterwards. All the business of the Church, such as calling a minister, making a contract with him, fixing and providing for his salary, building houses of worship and the like, was transacted in open town meeting. The legislature of the Colony passed upon some of the matters which pertained solely to the spiritual affairs of the Church, and to its discipline, which are now determined upon by the Church. Seats in the meeting house were assigned by vote of the town. Thus at one time it was voted "that Mary Jiggles be seated in the third seat on the woman's side, where she is ordered by the town to sit;" at another time "that Mrs. Green, the deacon's wife, be seated in ye fore seat on the woman's side;" at still another time "that for the benefit of setting the psalm Mr. Fosdick is seated in the third seat at the end next the altar." These votes show somewhat of the relation of the town to ecclesiastical affairs prior to 1726.

Until 1657, "the whole territory from Nahantick on the east to Nahantick on the west, continued to be regarded as one township, acting together in town meeting. * * * They formed also but one ecclesiastical society" [Miss Caulkins] for the levying of ministerial rates. These rates were assessed upon the grand list, so that every property holder in the town was liable to be taxed for the support of the gospel. The payment of these rates was not a matter of choice. Thus September 21, 1664, a vote of the town was passed "to determine a more certain way for the ministry to be upheld amongst us." What way was decided upon we are not told. A committee was chosen at the same time to see that the people of "Pockatuck" paid their "rates to our towne as formerly they did." November 21 of that year Peter Blatchford was chosen "Atturney for the towne to see to the coming in of the minister's rates." This method of supporting the gospel continued till other denominations came into the field.

In 1661, a little over three years after the departure of Mr. Blinman, the town entered into contract with Mr. Gershom Bulkeley, of Concord, in the Colony of Massachusetts, to be their minister. He was a notable man, of notable parentage. He was not, like his predecessor, driven out of England, because of his Puritan principles. But his father was, and

he himself was a Puritan. He was a son of Rev. Peter Bulkeley, the first minister of Concord, Massachusetts. His mother was Grace, the daughter of Sir Richard Chitwood. The story is told that she apparently died on her passage to this country. Her husband, thinking that land was near, was not willing to bury her at sea. His wishes were respected. On the third day symptoms of vitality appeared. She recovered, and lived to a good old age. Gershom Bulkeley was born soon after the arrival of his parents in this country.

Peter Bulkeley, his father, was son of Rev Edward Bulkeley, D. D., of Odell, Bedfordshire, England; was born January 31, 1583; was educated at Saint John's College, Cambridge; received there the degree of A. M. in 1608, and was chosen a fellow of his Alma Mater. He seems to have inherited a considerable estate from his father, and therefore to have been a man of some wealth. For the History of Concord, Mass., says "many of the first settlers were men of acknowledged wealth, enterprise, talents and education in their native country. Several were of noble families. The Rev. Peter Bulkeley brought more than 6,000 pounds sterling." He succeeded his father in the parish of Odell in 1619-20, and though his non-conformist principles were well known, he was allowed, through the favor of the

bishop of Lincoln, who was his diocesan, to remain unmolested in his parish for fifteen years. But when Laud became Primate of England he was silenced and ejected from his living. He sold his property and came to this country in 1635. He was settled at Concord, Mass., April 6, 1637, and died there March 9, 1658, aged 76 years.

This father of Gershom Bulkeley was a great man. The history of Concord says that he "became an author of distinguished celebrity." In 1637 he, together with Thomas Hooker, was chosen moderator of the Synod, held at Cambridge, which condemned Antinomianism, and probably inaugurated those dealings with the persons holding these views, which resulted in the banishment of Ann Hutchinson and her brother-in-law, Rev. John Wheelwright, and the fining of a number of prominent citizens who sympathized with her. "In its result the council stated and condemned eighty-two erroneous opinions and nine unwholesome expressions, besides specifying many texts of Scripture which had been abused." [Congregationalists in America, p. 134.] Of the two men, Peter Bulkeley and Thomas Hooker, who presided over this council it was said, "two as able and judicious divines as any country affords, by whom the disputes were managed with all liberty and fidelity to be desired." President Stiles said of

Peter Bulkeley that he “ was a masterful reasoner in theology.” He added, “ I consider him and President Chauncey, Mr. Hooker, Mr. Norton and Mr. Davenport as the greatest divines among the first ministers of New England, and equal to the first characters in theology in all Christendom and in all ages.” The following estimate of Peter Bulkeley is expressed in verse :

Riches and honors Buckley layes aside
To please his Christ, for whom he now doth war ;
Why, Buckley ! thou hast riches that will bide,
And honors that exceed earth’s honors far.

Of such truly noble parentage was Mr. Gershom Bulkeley born December 26, 1635.

He graduated from Harvard College in 1655, when but twenty years of age. October 26, 1659, he was married to Sarah Chauncey, only daughter of the president of Harvard College. When he came to New London in 1661, his widowed mother followed him and dwelt here till she died. The house in which she lived was bought of William Hough, and stood “ hard below the meeting house that now is.” The lot originally belonged to Mr. Obadiah Bruen. Mr. Bradstreet, in a notice of her death recorded in his diary, pays her the following worthy tribute: “ April 21 (1669) Mrs. Grace Bulkley, ye widow of Mr. Peter Bulkley, sometime pastour of ye chh in Concord, deceased. She was a woman of great piety

and wisdome, and dyed in a good old Age. Her sickness was long and very afflictive. She was sick near 3 months before she dyed. * * * April 25, 69 (being Sabbath day), she was interred, her soul 3 days before was entered upon an everlasting Sabbath of rest. She dyed and was buried in N. London. Blessed are those who dye in ye Lord, &c." She is buried in an unmarked grave in our ancient cemetery.

Soon after Mr. Bulkeley came to New London, an item acted on in town meeting relates to repairs on the Blinman meeting house. It is as follows: "Dec. 1, 1661. The towne have agreed with Goodman Elderkin and Goodman Waller to repare the turret of the meeting house, and to pay them what they shall demand in reason."

The contract with Mr. Bulkeley was entered into after he had preached here several months, with a view to permanence. No reference was made, at the time, to ordination. He was hired for a term of years. He was never ordained as pastor of the Church, although this was the wish of the town. For "January 15, 1663-4, James Rogers, Lev. Smith, Cary Latham and William Hough are appoynted to goe to Mr. Bulkeley for the settling him amongst us;" that is, to urge his consent to ordination. And Thomas Miner records in his diary, August 16, 1663, "goodman Cheeseboro desired the in-

habitants to meet for the settling of the ministrice and other things.” This effort to make permanent a ministry which had hitherto been but temporary, was not successful.

The salary pledged to Mr. Bulkeley was £80 a year for three years, and after that more if they were able, and inclined, to give more. The amount of increase, if any sum were added to the stipulated salary, was left to the state of the hearts of the town’s people at the time. For the agreement read, “or as much more as God shall move their hearts to give, and they do find it needful to be paid.” This was a perfectly safe agreement for the town to make, for they seem to have had their hearts so well in hand that they were not moved to give more than the £80. The salary promised “was to be reckoned in provisions or English goods.” In addition it was provided that Mr. Bulkeley, for the first three years, should have “all such silver as is weekly contributed by strangers, to help towards the buying of books;” so that the new pastor need not be bookless. Further than this, the town agreed to defray the expenses of moving from Concord—an undertaking of no small magnitude, and attended with considerable difficulty and expense in those days. Still further the town bound itself to “provide him with a dwelling house, orchard, gardeu and pasture, and with upland and

meadow for a small farm." Thus the first two ministers of the first Church were agriculturists in their way, though Mr. Bulkeley never became so large a land owner as Richard Blinman. Besides, the town promised to supply Mr. Bulkeley with fire wood yearly for the use of his family, and to "do their endeavor to suit him with a servant-man or youth, and maid, he paying for their time." Finally it was agreed that, if he should die during his ministry, his wife and children should receive from the town "the full and just sum of £60 sterling."

There seems to have been some difficulty about providing a dwelling house. To obviate it Mr. Bulkeley proposed to release the town from this obligation, and to provide a house for himself. He also proposed to release the town from their promise to pay to his family £60 in case of his death, if they would pay him in hand £80. To this the town agreed on condition that he remain as their minister seven years. But "in case he remove before the 7 yeere he is to return the 80 l. agen, but if he stay the 7 yeere out, the 80 l. is wholly given him, or if God take him away before this tyme of 7 yeeres, the whole is given his wife and children." Evidently this did not contemplate any other taking away than death. For in 1666 a committee, consisting of Mr. William Douglass and goodman Hough, was appoint-

ed "to demand the 80 pound of Mr. Buckley which he stands ingaged to pay to ye towne." This demand was pressed till it was paid. To meet this obligation Mr. Bulkeley gave back to the town £30 which were voted him in 1666 for preaching after his ministry had ended, and in 1668 he mortgaged his house and lot to Samuel Shrimpton, of Boston, to secure the remaining £50.

Having freed the town from their agreement to provide a parsonage for him, Mr. Bulkeley purchased the home of Samuel Lathrop, who was about to remove to Norwich. The house stood beyond the mill brook on the east side of what is now known as North Main street. It still stands [1897], and forms the more ancient part of the dwelling of the late Abraham Bragaw, No. 11 North Main street. In it are many of the original timbers of which it was constructed by Mr. Lathrop. Here Mr. Bulkeley lived during his residence in New London.

As we have seen, efforts were made by the town to get his consent to ordination. But for reasons which do not appear he refused. He continued to minister to the Church till June 1665, when, by his own act, his relation to the town was brought to an end. That his ministry was acceptable to the people is evident from the fact already stated, that a committee of the town were appointed to wait on him with refer-

ence to his ordination and permanent settlement in the pastorate.

He was a preacher of more than local celebrity. For Mr. Hoadly says that at sometime during his ministry, "though in what year has not been ascertained, it seems that he preached the annual election sermon, of which the text was Romans xiii : 7." Further, he was several times appointed by the General Court upon important committees respecting ecclesiastical affairs. So that his widely recognized abilities were likely to give him a strong hold upon the people to whom he ministered.

Not only did the town attempt to have him ordained as their permanent pastor, but also they signified their desire to have him continue among them in the ministerial office by passing the following vote, February 25, 1663-4; "Mr. Buckley for enlarging maintenance yt he may keep a man and also take the getting of wood into his owne hands—if not let 10 l. more be aded to our town rate for wood cutting and carting." It will be remembered that, by the original contract, the town was to furnish his yearly supply of wood. Under the same date the following vote was passed; "it is agreed by the towne that henceforward Mr. Buckley shall have six score pound a yeere, in provision pay, good and marchandable, he freeing the towne from all other ingagements."

These votes show that the relations between Mr. Bulkeley and his people were harmonious. No sign of uneasiness appears till a vote of the town, February 25, 1664-5, to the following effect. "The towne being desired to declare there myndes concerning Mr. Bulkley, it was propounded whether they were willing to leave Mr. Bulkley to the libertye of his conscience without any compelling him, or enforcing him to anything in the execution of his place and office contrarye to his light according to the lawes of the commonwealth. Voated to be their myndes." To what this liberty of conscience referred we are not told. We may presume that it had somewhat to do with his departure a few months later. Evidently he had been speaking his mind freely upon some topic, and his sentiments were not acceptable to all his people. He was a man of very decided convictions, and had the courage of them. He was no brawler, but a man of peace. So, rather than live in contention, actual or possible, he withdrew from his pastorate here. He was evidently not a man easily moved from his purpose, when once it was taken. Although the town voted him the fullest liberty of conscience to speak and act, yet the fact that the question was raised at all, betrayed a disposition on the part of some, from which an independent mind would shrink, and may have revealed to him a difference between him and

some of his people likely to widen, and convinced him that the way of separation was the way of peace. At any rate he withdrew from his ministry here after somewhat more than three years.

Strenuous efforts were made to retain him, and to shake him in his purpose to withdraw. For not only did the town vote him liberty to speak and act as his conscience should dictate, but also, June 10, 1665 the following vote was passed : “The Towne understanding Mr. Buckleys intention to goe into the Bay have sent James Morgan and Mr. Douglas to desire him to stay untill seacond day com seventnight which day the Towne have agreed to ask againe Mr. Fitch to speake with him in order to know Mr. Buckleys mynde fullye whether he will continue with us or no to preach the gospell.” This Mr. Fitch, whose good offices were sought by the town, was probably the pastor of the First Church in Norwich, who had emigrated with his people from Saybrook in 1660. As steps were taken at once to secure his successor, it is evident that Mr. Fitch’s persuasions did not shake Mr. Bulkeley’s purpose to retire from his ministry over this Church.

The reasons for this step on his part can only be surmised from certain facts gathered here and there. It is certain that the separation was not due to any lack of ability in his pulpit ministrations. For he is

spoken of as having rare abilities, and excellent learning, and as being “a truly great man.” It is also certain that he did not leave because any feelings of bitterness had sprung up between him and the people. For besides their efforts to retain him as their settled pastor, we may note the fact that he continued to reside in town nearly two years, and frequently to supply the pulpit, until Mr. Bradstreet came. In recognition of his services, as occasional supply, the town “voated and agreed that Mr. Buckley for his time and paines taken in preaching the word of God to us since the time of his yeere was expired shall have thirty pounds to be gathered by rate.” This was a proceeding not unmixed with shrewdness on the part of the town, for thereby they gained thirty of the eighty pounds which they demanded Mr. Bulkeley to return, because he departed before the expiration of seven years.

The firmness with which he refused to reconsider his decision to leave, in spite of such demonstrations of regard, suggests that there were some reasons for taking the step which, in his mind, outweighed every other consideration.

The weakness of his voice, because of which, says Judge Adams, “he practically ceased preaching” altogether a few years later, may have had some influence in bringing him to this decision. Trumbull

says, "by reason of infirmity he resigned the ministry many years before his death."

J. H. Trumbull, and Palfrey both state personal qualities of Mr. Bulkeley, from their point of view, which may help further to account for his leaving New London against the evidently unanimous desire of the people. Mr. Trumbull says "over-weening self-importance, obstinate adherence to his own opinions or prejudices, a litigious spirit, and the peculiarities of his political creed, detracted from his usefulness, and kept him almost constantly at strife with his parish, his neighbors, or the government of the Colony." Palfrey says, "he was always a discontented and troublesome person, and what he has written respecting these times is to be taken with large allowance for his being a bigoted partisan of Andros." These qualities may have developed to a certain degree in later life. But other testimony as to his noble personal qualities will set him before us in quite a different light. What Trumbull calls obstinacy, and Palfrey discontent, was doubtless a quality of character in him, but not deserving so obnoxious names. Gurdon Russell, M. D., of Hartford, in a paper read May 25, 1892, speaking of his leaving New London, said, "it might have been due to restlessness or independence of character which was occasionally manifested in after life." Against the charge that he was

“constantly at strife with his parish” it may be urged that the people of New London made every effort to prevent his leaving them, and that the Church in Wethersfield, after he had been its pastor for ten years, attempted to retain him by voting to provide him an assistant, on account of his infirmities and the weakness of his voice. While the statements of Trumbull and Palfrey do injustice to Mr. Bulkeley, he doubtless had a certain positive force and decision of character, which made him a difficult man to manage, and which they interpreted as obstinacy and discontent. This positive force of character, resenting the questioning of his authority expressed in the vote of the town February 25, 1664-5, may shed some light upon his refusal to remain as minister of the Church, in spite of the earnest solicitation of the people.

A final possible reason for his leaving New London and a possible explanation of the town’s vote “to leave Mr. Bulkeley libertye of conscience,” may be found in the new way, known as the “Parish” or “Presbyterian” way, which had crept into the practice of some of the Churches in the Colony. Mr. Bulkeley favored the new, as opposed to the old, or Congregational way, as appears from this entry in the diary of Thomas Miner: “The 23d of March (1663-4) I was informed by H. g. that * * *

Mr. Buckley would be at the fast at R. h. his house, and would be helpful to gather a H. After the pr's beteriall way; 24 day March." Mr. Hoadly says [Preface to Will and Doom]: "In his opinions respecting ecclesiastical polity he was inclined to Presbyterianism, rather than Congregationalism; the political sentiments which he avows in the preface of this book would hardly be compatible with the latter." Presbyterianism is a system of centralized ecclesiastical authority. Against this it may be that the Church rebelled. For, Dr. Chapin, in an address at the centennial of Glastonbury, said of Mr. Bulkeley, "he was a man of peace, but at the same time was one who expected unqualified obedience to authority. A slight questioning of this kind led to his resignation of the parish of New London." It is quite true that "he was a man of peace," but not one of the peace-at-any-cost sort. If he would not stay in a controversy, neither would he seek to purchase peace by compromising his convictions. He took the other course, and withdrew. It must be, therefore, that all estimates of his character, which present him as a contentious man, do him injustice.

What the questioning, to which Dr. Chapin refers, was about does not appear. But the vote of the town granting him full liberty of conscience in speaking

his mind in the exercise of his office, justifies the view that his pulpit utterances had been challenged. Besides, the Douglass Genealogy [p. 57] says that "in 1664-5 the Church began to feel some uneasiness in regard to their minister's views," and it seems probable that it was because of this uneasiness that the vote granting him liberty of conscience was taken.

The opinions which encountered the opposition of his people could not at the time have been political, as Mr. J. H. Trumbull implies. For as late as 1675, nine years after he left New London, he took a prominent part in defending the autonomy of the Colony against the efforts of Sir Edmund Andros to enlarge the dominions of the Duke of York within Connecticut. Mr. Bulkeley's preference for a centralized form of government, as it appears in *Will and Doom*, and in other of his writings, brought him into sympathy with those methods of Church administration which involved all the points in dispute under the Half-way Covenant touching baptism and Church membership. The temper of the Church, which flatly refused to adopt the Saybrook Platform ninety years later, indicates that it did not take kindly to the new way. It seems almost certain, therefore, that his leaving New London had reference to some of these ecclesiastical questions which were beginning to disturb the Churches.

But be that as it may, in June, 1665, he stepped down and out of his first pulpit, of his own accord. He remained in town till some time in the early part of 1667, when he went to Wethersfield to assume charge of the Church in that town. The date of his ordination and installation as pastor of that Church is given in an entry in the journal of his successor in New London, Rev. Simon Bradstreet, which is as follows: "Oct. 27 [1669] Mr. Gershom Bulkeley was ordained at Wethersfield by Mr. Joseph Rowlandson and Mr. Samuel Willard." He held that office till his health obliged him to relinquish it in 1677. On retiring from the ministry he removed to Glastonbury and gave himself to the practice of medicine and to politics. Rev. A. C. Adams, pastor in Wethersfield from 1868 to 1879, in an historical sketch of that Church, says of Mr. Bulkeley, he "was evidently a man of genuine goodness, and large ability. He broke down in health, however, early, and after ten years exchanged the ministry for the practice of medicine, in which, as also in the service of the State, he was much distinguished. One entry in the town records I like the tone of: 'The town, being informed by their honored pastor that it was too hard for him, and beyond his power, by reason of weakness of voice, to carry on the whole work of the ministry, they declare themselves ready to provide an-

other minister to assist him in his work, and to be a help and comfort to him ; and they desire that their honored pastor would afford them his advice and direction respecting a meet process for that work, for which they will be thankful to him, and will take the same into serious consideration.' " But the state of his health was such that he retired from the public ministrations of the gospel to practice the healing art.

It is testimony to his surgical and medical abilities that the General Court, in 1675, while he was yet in the ministry, appointed him "surgeon to the army that had been raised against the Indians, and Mr. Stone was directed to supply the place of Mr. B. in his absence. After his return from King Philip's war, he asked a dismission from the Church at Wethersfield, on account of the state of his health, removed to the east side of the river, and commenced practice as a physician, which he continued over thirty years." [Manual of the Church in Wethersfield.] In the Colonial Records I find the following vote of the General Court, October, 1686: "This court being well acquainted with the ability, skill and knowledge of Mr. Gershom Bulckly, in the arts of phissick and chirurgery, doe grant him full and free liberty and license to practice in the administration of phissick and chirurgery as there shall be occasion and he shall be capeable to atend." His medical skill was so great,

and he was so widely known, that he was summoned from far and near to attend upon severe cases of disease. One of his descendants [Mrs. Caroline Bulkley Stuart] has a large box full of his medical writings, which bear witness to his remarkable industry. Mr. Trumbull says of him: "Mr. Bulkley was viewed as one of the greatest physicians and surgeons;" and Dr. Chauncey says, "I have heard him mentioned as a truly great man, and eminent for his skill in chemistry." His medical opinion secured the reprieve of one Abigail Thompson, who was under sentence of death for the crime of murder. In the Glastonbury centennial it is said of him, "as a minister Mr. Bulkeley was of the first class, while as a physician he stood at the head of his profession." "He was famous as a surgeon, prominent as a chemist, and highly respected as a magistrate."

In 1679 he represented the town of Wethersfield in the General Court. Mr. Hoadley says that there are still "among our State archives some of his legal opinions and briefs." The same authority says that "the letters addressed to the General Assembly on this subject (Andros' attempt to take territory away from Connecticut) are in Bulkeley's handwriting, and suggest that he was *magna pars* of the affair, which was very adroitly managed." It may be added that the schemes of Andros were at that time

defeated, and Mr. Bulkeley was on the popular side in politics.

He was not always on the popular side, but on the side which he believed to be right, and advocated it fearlessly. In October, 1687, Sir Edmund Andros was again in Hartford; this time to demand the charter. The story is familiar; how, while the Assembly was debating whether or not to surrender the document, the lights were suddenly extinguished, and when they were relighted, the charter, which had been lying on the table, was missing. "And now," says Roger Wolcott, "Sir Edmund being in town and the charters gone, the secretary closed the Colony Records with the word *Finis* and all departed." Mr. Bulkeley, who never favored any least approach to a democratic form of government, held that the Colony had surrendered the right of self-government guaranteed by the charter. Thus, he said, "we think that the Colony of Connecticut is *de jure* (we wish we could say *de facto*), as much subject to the government of the crown of England as London or Oxford." When, therefore, in 1689, Sir Edmund was imprisoned in Boston and Mr. Bradstreet was reinstated as Governor of the Bay Colony, and the missing charter of Connecticut was brought forth from its hiding place, and the Colony once more resumed the reins of government, Mr. Bulkeley, joined

by Mr. Edward Palmes, and some others of equal note, opposed the proceedings, and refused to recognize the Colonial government. He was now on the unpopular political side. Says Dr. Chapin, in his Glastonbury address, "as a politician he was opposed to the resumption of the government by the Colonial authorities in 1689 after the time of Sir Edmund Andros." His "political foresight and sagacity

* * * enabled him to see that the course the Colonists were pursuing would finally lead to the triumph of those democratic principles which they all disavowed, and consequently he set his face against them." In pursuance of his efforts to prevent the re-establishment of the charter government, he addressed a letter to the convention met at Hartford, May 8, 1689, upon The People's Right to Election or Alteration of Government in Connecticut argued. But the Colony proceeded to resume government under its restored charter, and in 1692, Dec. 12, Mr. Bulkeley issued his famous pamphlet, *Will and Doom, or The Miseries of Connecticut by and under an Usurped and Arbitrary Power.* It was an argument in behalf of the divine right of kings. A single sentence from the preface will give its keynote: "A lawful authority is the root, and the law of the land is the rule, of justice; we want both, we have no way to come at either without a stream flow-

ing from their sacred majesties, who, under God, are the fountain." Lord Cornbury and Joseph Dudley made use of this book in their efforts against Connecticut, but without avail. Sir Henry Ashurst, the Colony's agent in England, speaks of it as having been sent over, "all by Mr. Dudley's contrivance." And Lord Cornbury wrote to England in 1704 saying, "I take the liberty to send your lordships the laws of Connecticut, and with them a book writ by one Mr. Buckley, who is an inhabitant of Connecticut. By that you will be informed of the methods of proceeding in that Colony." But as late as this Mr. Bulkeley does not seem to have had any grievance against the Colony, nor to have taken an active part in politics.

Mr. Bulkeley was a man of marked ability, and his hand was strong, and made itself felt, upon whatever he touched. He wrote a book upon the divinity of the Scriptures, which he left for the use of his children. He gave his theological manuscripts to his son John, the first minister of Colchester. Some of his books are said to be in the library of Trinity College. It was said of him that "he was master of several languages, among which may be reckoned Greek, Latin and Dutch." Dr. Russell said of him, "from all I can gather about him, he was a learned and pious clergyman of very high order." Upon the

stone, in the Wethersfield cemetery, which marks his grave, is this inscription, which testifies to his worth, and rare qualities of character : " He was honorable in his descent ; of rare abilities, extraordinary industry, excellent learning, master of many languages, exquisite in his skill in divinity, physic and law, and of a most exemplary and Christian life. In certam spem beatae resurrectionis repositus." A sentence from his will, dated May 26, 1712, will show something of his character. " The said Gershom Bulkely having lived much more than twenty years upon the very mouth of the grave, under so great infirmities that I can not but wonder how I have all this while escaped falling into it, have not been wholly unmindful of that which nature and prudence call for in such cases." Then follow the bequests which need not be repeated here. He died, it is supposed of small pox, December 2, 1713, aged 78 years. Fifteen days later, Dec. 17, Rev. James Pierpont, pastor of the First Church in New Haven, wrote lamenting the " hasty removal of three so valuable men, Mr. Bulkeley, Haynes and Russel. Surely," he continues, " it's not unfit in such a critical junc-
ture, when so many cedars fall, to cry, Ah Lord ! wilt thou not make a full end ? Ah ! help Lord, for ye godly man ceaseth."

This brief sketch of his life justifies the remark of

one of his descendants, the Hon. Morgan G. Bulkeley, that he "was a prominent and distinguished figure among the men of the Colony during the time in which he lived." He exerted a wide influence, and his opinions were honored, even by those who were opposed to him politically.

Many of his descendants have held prominent positions in social, political, and religious life. Charles, his eldest son, was licensed by the Colonial Court, to practice medicine. He settled in New London in 1687. He had a son Charles, who lived to the advanced age of ninety-five, and died in 1848. He was the father of Leonard Bulkeley, the founder of Bulkeley school. Peter, the second son, and fourth child of Gershom Bulkeley, was lost at sea. Edward, the third son and fifth child, lived in Wethersfield. From him was descended another Gershom Bulkeley, who was for thirty years pastor of the Church at Cromwell. John, the fourth son and sixth child of Gershom Bulkeley, graduated from Harvard College in 1699, at the age of twenty, and was settled as the first minister of Colchester Dec. 20, 1703, where he died June, 1731. From him is descended the Hon. Morgan G. Bulkeley, recently Governor of this State. The two daughters of Gershom Bulkeley married and settled in Wethersfield and Glastonbury.

VI.

SIMON BRADSTREET'S PASTORATE.

MAY, 1666.—AUGUST, 1683.

The town at once set about the task of securing a successor to Mr. Bulkeley. For July 10, 1665, there is this record: “If it be your myndes yt Mr. James Rogers shall goe in behalfe of the towne to Mr. Brewster to give him a call and to know whether he will come to us to be our minister * * * manifest it by lifting up your hands. Voted.” Probably this was Nathaniel Brewster, of Brookhaven, L. I. The invitation seems to have been declined. For October 9, of the same year, the following action was taken: “Mr. Douglas by a full voate none manifesting themselves to the contrary, was chosen to go to Mr. Wilson and Mr. Elliot to desire their advise and help for the procureinge of a minister for the towne.” Mr. Wilson had come from England with Winthrop, and was teacher of the First Church in Shawmut, or Boston, till he died in 1667. Elliot was the pastor of the First Church in Roxbury for fourteen years, and then became the famous apostle to the Indians.

Evidently Mr. Douglas went upon his mission at once. For "November 24 a town meeting concerning what Mr. Douglas hath done about a minister" was held. At the same meeting it was voted that a letter should be sent to Deacon William Park, of Roxbury, asking him to intercede with Mr. Bradstreet in behalf of the town to persuade him to come to it as its minister; and it was voted that "full powre be given to Mr. Parke to act in our behalf, the towne expressing themselves willing to give 60 lb., and rather than the work seas, to proceed to ten pound more, giving our trusty friend liberty to treat with others in case our desire of Mr. Broadstreet faile." October 5 and 30, 1666, the town voted a piece of land to Mr. Douglas, "which is for his satisfaction for his journey to Boston." January 12, 1665-6, a town meeting was held, at which the following items of business were attended to: "The return of Mr. Bradstreet's letter to be read," "a rate to underpin the meeting house," "concerning messengers to goe for Mr. Bradstreet;" "Also for a place where he shall be when he comes." February 26, 1665-6, "It was voated that Left^t Avery and James Morgan be chosen messengers to fetch up Mr. Bradstreet as soon as moderate weather presents." "It is voated and agreed that the townsmen shall have power to provide what is needful for the Messengers that are

sent to Mr. Bradstreet and allso to provide for him a place to reside in at his coming." It was voted also that Mr. Avery and Mr. Morgan should have full power to engage a suitable horse "to be emploied in fetching up Mr. Bradstreet," and the town voted to fulfill any agreement which they might make. Later ten shillings were voted "to Goodman Prentice for his horse," and 15 lb. "to Goodman Royce for ye minister's dyet." From these votes it appears that Deacon Park's intercessions had prevailed, and that Mr. Bradstreet had accepted the call. It was also "voted that a Towne rate of 40 lb. be made immediately for ye payment of Towne depts and providing to acomadate a minister and repareing the meeting house." Thus all the preparations were completed for the commencement of Mr. Bradstreet's ministry.

At the meeting, at which the foregoing arrangements were made, it was voted that "John Smith and goodman Nichols shall receive contribution every Lord's daye and preserve it for ye publick good." August 15, 1667, is a similar vote worth preserving: "Myselfe [Douglas] chosen to hold the box for contributions and this to be propounded to Mr. Bradstreet to have his advise therein. Williams Nichols is also chosen for that worke." The contribution box is not a modern innovation.

The journey from Boston to New London was a greater undertaking then, when there was no road save a path through the wilderness, than now. Thirty years before it took Thomas Hooker and his company two weeks to go from Cambridge to Hartford; and their journey was over “a toilsome way, through a pathless wilderness, over mountains and across unbridged rivers, with only a compass for a guide.” We have no reason to suppose that, in the spring of 1666, Mr. Bradstreet found the trip much shorter, or much more comfortable, than Thomas Hooker did in 1636. This little touch of history shows what it cost the fathers to lay the foundations, and of what stuff they were made.

In pursuance of the vote to provide a place for the minister “to reside in at his coming,” a lot was purchased of Mr. Douglas and Mrs. Grace Bulkeley, which lay south of the meeting house; that is, on the south side of what is now called Bulkeley Square. It will be remembered that Mrs. Bulkeley was the mother of Rev. Gershom Bulkeley, and that she removed to New London on the death of her husband, where she was a house-holder during the ministry of her son. For the temporary use of Mr. Bradstreet the house vacated by Mr. Bulkeley was hired for one year from April 1, 1667, together with the orchard and six acre lot, for the sum of ten pounds.

Mr. Bradstreet arrived in town early in May, 1666. June 1 of that year it was "voted by a Vnanimous consent that Mr. Bradstreet is accepted in ye worke of ye ministry amongst us, and that he have 80 lb. pr yeare to encourage him in the worke, to be gathered by way of rate." It will be noticed that this sum is ten pounds larger than the limit allowed by the town to Deacon Park. Evidently the new minister proved quite as acceptable a preacher as had been anticipated. At the same meeting it was voted to build a house "for ye ministry" immediately, on the lot purchased of Mr. Douglas and Mrs. Bulkeley, "the dimensions to be 36 foote in length and 25 in breadth and 13 studd betwixt ye joynts with a stack of stone chimneys in the midst. The house to be a girt house." The town voted to give 100 pounds for building the house, besides paying the "masons for building a stone chimney and glaze ye house windowes." The work was pushed forward with energy, and completed about September 3, 1668. It was the business of the whole town to erect it, and the people were often called together to vote as to various questions, such as the size of the cellar, who should dig it, who should do the iron work, etc. When it was finished a committee was appointed to inspect the work, and the masons in particular were not to be paid till it was ascertained that the chimneys were

sufficient. The cost came very nearly within the 100 pounds voted for the purpose. At the same meeting, June 1, 1666, it was voted that the house "built for the ministry," together with the house and land bought of Mr. Douglas, and the land which "hitherto hath been reserved for the ministry," shall remain so, nor "be sold or alienated to any other vse forever." It is scarcely necessary to say that this vote, on the death of Mr. Bradstreet, became a dead letter, as the property was sold to Nicholas Hallam in 1697.

Mr. Bradstreet was now on the ground. In December, 1667, a committee was appointed to secure his immediate ordination. But for reasons which do not appear this event did not take place till three years later—October 5, 1670. So that at his ordination he had already been doing the work of the ministry since some time in May, 1666—over four years.

The salary of 80 lb. a year voted to Mr. Bradstreet, was soon raised to 90 pounds "in current country pay, with firewood furnished, and the parsonage kept in repair." This was soon increased again to 100 pounds, which was equal to the salary of the most noted ministers of New England at that date.

In this connection the following votes are of interest, as showing the customs of those early times.

“Sept. 9, 1669. In answer to Mr. Broadstreet’s proposition for easing him in the chardge of his wood the towne doe freely consent to help him therein, and some with carts and some for cutting and that next traineing daye a tyme be appoynted for accomplishment thereof and that Leiff^t Avery be deputed to nominate ye daye.” Another vote is the following: “16 Jan., 1670-1. Mr. Edward Palmes hath liberty granted to make a seat for himself and relations at ye north end of ye pulpit.” From this vote it would seem that the first meeting house stood east and west, with sides to the north and south. Another vote, of the same date, to put galleries of the width of two seats, “on each side of ye meeting house,” points to the prosperity of the Church under the new minister. As we shall see, even with this addition the house became too small for the increasing congregations. These facts, together with the material increase of his salary, justify the conclusion that Mr. Bradstreet was no ordinary preacher and pastor.

After serving the Church a little over four years, he was formally inducted into the pastoral office by ordination. The diary of Thomas Miner says, “the ffift day” of October, 1670, “mr. broadstreet was ordayne^d.” Mr. Bradstreet wrote in his own journal, “October 5, 1670, I was ordained by Mr. Bulkley

(Gershom Bulkeley) and Mr. Haynes (Joseph Haynes of the First Church in Hartford) an established pastor of the Chh. of Christ at New London. The good Lord grannt I may so preach and so live, that I may save myself, and those who hear me.'’ Miss Caulkins says, “ this ordination was the first in town ; no previous minister had been regularly settled.’’ However, Mr. Blinman, as has been shown, was already an ordained clergyman when he came to America in 1640, and was regularly chosen as pastor of the Church in 1642, when it was organized in Gloucester. So that while Mr. Bradstreet’s was the first ordination, Mr. Blinman was the first ordained minister on the ground in the full exercise of the duties of a pastor.

As has been stated, Mr. Bradstreet began to keep the records of the Church, October 5, 1670. One of the entries says that children were baptized before that date ; but Mr. Bradstreet did not baptize them. For it was not deemed proper for an unordained person to administer the Sacraments. For example the Church in Plymouth was nine years without the administration of the Lord’s Supper. Brewster, who acted as pastor, had never been ordained. He was only ruling elder, whose office included the duties of preacher, when occasion required ; but he was not authorized to administer the Sacraments. When the Church, desirous of sitting at their Lord’s Table, pro-

posed to Brewster that he should assume the right to officiate at it, he demurred, and wrote to John Robinson for advice. Robinson replied that he did not deem it lawful for him, being only a ruling elder, to do so, and quoted Rom. xii: 7, 8 and I Tim. v: 17 in support of this view. We know that similar sentiments governed the action of Mr. Bradstreet, for an entry in the diary of Thomas Miner reads: "The 15 [January, 1670-1] was the ffirst sacrament of the lord's supper administered by mr. broadstreet." This was three months after his ordination, and may point to the custom of celebrating this Sacrament quarterly. Mr. Miner's diary speaks of its continued observance from this date on.

The names of those who composed the Church at Mr. Bradstreet's ordination, as recorded by him, may be found on page 41. He gives no names of those who were deacons at that date, but Thomas Park, John Smith, William Douglas and William Hough, without doubt, held that office.

Following the list of members are the names of those added subsequently. In a number of instances the record reads "added and confirmed," or simply "confirmed." Thus Mr. Bradstreet records the following, "confirmed, April 30, 1671, Clement Miner," afterwards deacon Miner; "added and confirmed May 14, 1671, Gabriel Harris and his wife." What sig-

nificance attached to the word "confirmed" in his mind we have no means of knowing. The last entry of accessions to the Church during his ministry is, "Sept. 10, 1682, Thomas Avery and wife were added to the Church." It was this man's son, Thomas, who was an original member of the Church in Montville. Forty-three names are on the list of those who were added after his ordination—thirty-nine upon profession of faith, and four by letter. We know that three whose names do not appear on any list, Goodman Rice, Lydia Bailey and Ruth Hill were received before his ordination, making an addition of forty-six during his ministry of seventeen years. Add these to the list at his ordination and we find that seventy-two was the total recorded membership of the Church during his pastorate. No additions were made between September 2, 1673, and August 26, 1677—a period of four years. Evidently the Church was in a low spiritual state. The cause is not certain. But the Rogerene movement, which began during his ministry, may have been responsible to some degree. The Half-way Covenant was crowding its way into the Churches of Connecticut, and may also have exerted some damaging influence upon this Church, even though the pastor did not practice it.

Mr. Bradstreet recorded the baptism of 455 persons, mostly children; 438 of his own Church, and

17 of other Churches, thus he records the baptism of the children of persons belonging to the Churches in Roxbury, in Hartford, in Ipswich, in Rehoboth, in Norwich, and in Lyme. Miss Caulkins says of the baptism of those belonging to his own Church, that "a considerable number were adults; some parents being baptized themselves, at the time that they owned the covenant and presented their children for baptism." But there is no record of this kind during the ministry of Mr. Bradstreet; nor is there any evidence that he ever baptized a child, neither of whose parents were in full communion in the Church. On the contrary there is evidence the other way. Thus one of the entries upon the Church records, made by him, reads as follows: "The names of such as were called the children of the Church, viz., of such as had been baptized before Oct. 5, 1670, their parents one or both being in full communion." The pains which he takes to mention that one or both the parents of the children were in full communion, seems conclusive proof that he did not practice the Half-way Covenant. However, the baptized children of the Church were regarded as within its pale, by the terms of God's covenant with his people, but not entitled to its full privileges until conversion and public profession of faith in Christ. Thus it is recorded, "Aug. 14, 1681, Goodwife Geerey received

into full communion." This cannot be understood as an action akin to the Half-way Covenant, but as receiving into full fellowship one who was a baptized child of the Church.

Baptisms usually followed close upon births. In some cases not more than two or three days passed. Not only children, but also grandchildren, and servants bound to apprenticeship, and slaves, might be presented by one who would give a pledge for their Christian education; that is, become a sponsor for them. Thus Mr. Bradstreet makes the following record, May 7, 1671: "Two servants of Mr. Douglass his, for whom he engaged, ye one being an Indian bought when a child; and at his Disposal. I baptized her according to God's command in Genesis xvii, 12, 13 Elizabeth (the Indian) Mary." It must be borne in mind that Mr. Douglas, the sponsor, or godfather, was a member of the Church, and one of its deacons. As early as 1634 a member of the Church in Dorchester desired baptism for a grandchild, neither of whose parents were members of the Church. The advice of the Church in Boston was sought. It was given in these words: "We do therefore profess it to be the judgement of our Church * * * that the grandfather, a member of the Church, may claim the privilege of baptism to his grandchild, though his next of seed, the parents

of the child, be not received themselves into Church covenant." [Dunning, p. 172.] It also appears on the records of the Church, during the ministry of Mr. Bradstreet, that men presented their children for baptism, on the account of their wives who were in full communion. All the facts go to show that, in the matter of the baptism of children, Mr. Bradstreet held with Hooker, Davenport and others, that only the children of "visible saints" should be baptized.

There is no record of marriages by Mr. Bradstreet. Previous to 1680, marriage was regarded solely as a civil rite throughout New England. The ceremony was, therefore, performed by the civil magistrate, or by a person specially qualified by the Colonial authorities. Hutchinson says that, previous to 1684 "in Massachusetts there was no instance of a marriage by a clergyman during the existence of their first charter." Neale says "all marriages in New England were formerly performed by the civil magistrate." If a clergyman officiated, the ordinance was made valid by a civil officer. After 1680, or about that time, clergymen had the right, under the law, to perform the marriage ceremony.

The next item of importance relating to this pastorate is the building of a new house of worship to take the place of the Blinman meeting house which had served twenty-five years, was insufficient for the

needs of the growing town, and was going into decay. The town held a meeting in February, 1677-8, at which it was voted to build a new house by the side of the old one, the latter to be kept for use till the new house was completed. The work was contracted to be done in October, 1680, but it lingered for several years. The building committee were Captain Avery, Charles Hill and Thomas Beeby, who procured the timber, and made all preparations to proceed with the work. But a strong party favored an entirely new spot, "on Hempstead street at the southwest corner of Broad street." A vote was obtained to build on this new site. However, the dissatisfaction, especially among those on the east side of the river, was so great, that another meeting of the town was called April 19, 1679, to reconsider the subject. The following conciliatory action was taken: "The town sees cause for avoiding future animosities, and for satisfaction of our loving neighbors on the east side of the river to condescend that the new meeting house shall be built near the old, Mr. Bradstreet having spared part of his lot to be made him good on the other side, for the accommodation of this work; but that the vote above [i. e. before taken] was and is good in law, and irrevocable, but by the loving consent of neighbors is altered, which shall be no precedent for future alter-

ing any town vote." And so a difference, which was likely to prove serious, was amicably adjusted, and the place of worship was yet to remain on the old site for over one hundred years. The second, or Bradstreet, meeting house was therefore built near the old one, probably just west of it, on the southwest corner of what was called Meeting House Green, now Bulkeley Square. As part of the ground for the new house was taken from Mr. Bradstreet's lot, his house must have stood near the southwest corner of the square ; presumably near the spot now occupied by the house of Hon. Stephen A. Gardner.

It is not strange that the people on the east side of the river looked with disfavor upon even the least increase of their Sabbath day journeys. It was no small matter that they were obliged to travel a long distance and cross the river, and climb the hill through Richards street to the old place of worship. It was not always possible to cross the river. Thomas Miner, in his diary, records that " Sabbath day the 7 [Jan., 1654] I was at Pequit river and could not get over." Their opposition to the new site, farther away, was not without reason, and their wish justly prevailed with the majority.

The early New Englanders had a love for a Church set on a hill, as the white towers of many a town pointing heavenward from many a hilltop abundantly

prove. It may be because Jesus taught that his Church is to be like a city set on a hill; and also because, from its commanding position, it served both as a beacon and a watch-tower. Miss Caulkins says of the Blinman meeting house, what was also true of the Bradstreet meeting house, that "the cupola now became the lookout post of the watchman, and this rendered it a useful as well as an ornamental adjunct of the Church. The sentinel, from this elevated tower, commanded a prospect in which the solemnity of the vast forest was broken and relieved by touches of great beauty." The Hon. Augustus Brandegee tells us that the "early worshippers ascended from all parts of the town on each Sabbath, armed with Bible in one hand and the old flint-lock in the other, prepared to do valiant service against the Indians, the World, the Flesh, or the Devil, as occasion might require." But Captain John Mason had long ago settled the case of the Indians, so that Mr. Bradstreet's congregation, unless we except the year 1675, could give its entire attention to the World, the Flesh and the Devil, neither of which were lacking then, as they are not now.

The meeting house was still to stand on the hill, overlooking the town. Still might the people sing—

"The hill of Zion yields
A thousand sacred sweets."

Still could they say, “ Beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole Earth is Mount Zion.”

The contract was let to John Elderkin and Samuel Lothrop. They were allowed a year and a half to build the house. “ It was to be forty feet square; the studs twenty feet high with a turret answerable; two galleries, fourteen windows, three doors; and to set up on all the four gables of the house, pyramids comely and fit for the work, and as many lights in each window as direction should be given; * * * £240 to be paid in provision, viz. in wheat, pease, pork, and beef in quantity proportional; the town to find nails, glass, iron-work, and ropes for rearing; also to boat and cart the timber to the place, and provide sufficient help to rear the work.”

The finishing of the meeting house lingered. Repeated orders were voted concerning it. The pulpit was removed to it from the old house when the work was sufficiently advanced, and the new house seems to have been used in an unfinished state. The builders were accused of not keeping their contract. John Frink of Stonington and Edward deWolf of Lyme, were called in to arbitrate between the contractors and the town. September 6, 1682, two years after the house should have been finished, the town took vigorous action, and voted “ that the meeting house shall be completed and finished to worship God in;

according to conformity of duty of Church and Town, and Town and Church." At last the house was completed late in 1682, but not soon enough for Mr. Bradstreet to preach in it long, if at all; for his health had already begun to fail, and he died the next year.

During the building of the Church the parsonage was repaired, at the expense of the town, according to contract with Mr. Bradstreet. "One hundred acres of land in one entire piece," were voted to "Mr. Thomas Parkes, Senior," to remunerate him for furnishing "cedar clapboards," nails and work "for the parsonage house." Though this was called the parsonage, and the town house, and was to be kept in repair by the town, it had been given to Mr. Bradstreet in fee simple, and was his property.

In 1680 Mr. Bradstreet's health began to decline. In August of the next year he proposed to resign. But the people declined to accept his resiguation, and added "the town is willing to allow him comfortable maintenance as God shall enable them, and they will wait God's providence in respect to his health." His salary had been £100 a year. But at the same meeting it was "voted to allow him £120 a year in provision pay, and also to find him his fire-wood, ninety loads for the ensuing year." This was most generous provision for a pastor who was likely never to be

able to serve them more, and is conclusive proof of the strong hold which he had upon his people.

The Rogerene movement had its beginnings during the ministry of Mr. Bradstreet. James Rogers was a member of this Church. He was received into it, soon after Mr. Bradstreet's ordination, by letter from the Church in Milford. He is said to have been an upright, circumspect man. But in 1676 he and his sons were fined for profanation of the Sabbath, and for neglect of public worship, and were put under a bond of £10 each. This was repeated for a long course of years. It was at this time, 1676, that James Rogers and his wife left Mr. Bradstreet's Church to join the Sabbatarians, at Newport. Miss Caulkins says, "there is no account of any dealings with him and his wife on account of their secession from Mr. Bradstreet's Church." After a time John, who had also joined the Sabbatarians, withdrew from them, and promulgated notions peculiarly his own. May 25, 1675, Mr. Bradstreet writes concerning him in his diary: "John Rogers of N. London, aged aboute 28 (not many months before turned a proud Anabaptist) was arraigned at Hartford, at ye court of Assistants vpon tryall of his life. * * * The testimony agst him was his own wife (a prudent, sober young woman), to whom he told it with his own mouth, and not in trouble of mind, but in a boasting

manner of free grace yt he was pardoned. This was mvch about ye time yt he fell into yt cursed opinion of Anabaptisme." October 26, 1676, the General Court granted his wife a divorce, and the custody of the children, since he continued "in his evill practices." [Col. Records 1678-89, p. 144.] It is evident from all these facts, and Mr. Bradstreet's emphatic words, that the beginnings of the Rogerene movement took place during his ministry, and that it was a source of annoyance to him. A further and fuller account of it will be found in a subsequent chapter.

In 1664 a house of worship was built in the eastern portion of the parish. Mr. James Noyes came from Newbury, Mass., about September 8 of that year, and preached ten years as a licentiate, till June 3, 1674, when a Church was gathered in what was then called Southerton, but is now known as Stonington, and Mr. Noyes was ordained as pastor Thursday, September 10. [Thomas Miner.] It is now known as the Road Church.

This was the final outcome of the controversy between the people in Pequot and those residing in the eastern portion of the plantation, over the question of a new township, with its liberties and privileges. The territory, in which the new Church was gathered, was originally included in the parish of this Church.

Three at least of the charter members of this new organization had been members in New London, Mr. Thomas Miner, Captain Denison, and Mr. Thomas Stanton. [Diary of Thomas Miner.] Then the First Church in Stonington is the eldest daughter of the First Church in New London, and its formation was one of the important events of Mr. Bradstreet's pastorate.

He kept a journal, entitled "a Breif Record of remarkable Providences and Accidents," which he began in 1664 and continued to August 10, 1683, when the last entry was made, not long prior to his death. One, which very nearly concerned him is the following: "July 12, 1666, while I was at N. London, my father's house at Andover was burnt, where I lost my books and many of my clothes, to the value of 50 or £60 at least. The Lord gane and the Lord hath taken away, blessed bee the Name of the Lord. Tho my owne losse of books (and papers espec) was great and my father's far more, being about £800; yet ye Lord was pleased gratiouly many wayes to make vp ye same to us. It is therefore good to trust in the Lord." Under date of May, 1669, he writes in his journal of the severe winter in Massachnsetts, and adds, "this year the Lord frowned much vpon the country, by sickness in divers places, espec in this Colony of Connecticut. Divisions in Seuerall chhs; Blastings of

all sorts of grain that it was very scarce. Greater scarcity haueing not been known for very many years."

In November, 1677, he records the prevalence of the small pox in and about Boston, of which "many dyed." October 31, 1678, was set apart by the General Court of this Colony "as a day of publique thanksgiving to bless and prayse the Lord our God for his great goodness to his people manifested" in sparing the Colony this dread scourge, in continuing the gospel, in giving good health to the people, and in affording a bountiful harvest. October 4, 1679, Mr. Bradstreet records that "John Smith, one of ye deacons of this chh, a man of great piety and vse in chh and Town went to heaven."

The year 1681 seems to have been one of great severity throughout the Colony. The October sessions of the General Court for that year was adjourned without the usual order for a day of general thanksgiving. A foot note on p. 96 of the Colonial Records for 1678-1689 says that the omission was probably due to "the loss of the harvest and the sickness which was at that time prevalent." In his journal Mr. Bradstreet makes this entry for 1681. "In the mo of June, July and August was a great drought thro the covntry to great losse in corn and grasse, valued at many thousand pounds, yet god hath graciously left vs enough for a meat and drink offering.

Sept^r & Octob^r w^r sickly in many places in this Colony; the disease was a malignant feaver of w^{ch} many dyed." This fever evidently broke out again in 1683, as appears from the last entry in his journal, made in August of that year, and quoted below. Another entry is as follows: "July 26, 1682, Mr. William Douglas one of ye deacons of this church dyed in ye 72 year of his age. He was an able Christian and this poor chh will much want him." The last entry referred to above reads, "August 10, 1683, Will^m Hough Deacon of this chh aged about 64 dyed. He was a solid man and his death is a great Losse to chh & Town. The same day, and not above 2 or 3 hours after, Elizabeth Raymond (Daniel Raymond his wife) aged about 26 or 27 dyed. Shee was for her Piety, Prudence &c a very desirable person and has left but few of her Age behind her like her. They both dyed of malignant feaver w^{ch} was very severe thro: this Colony." The last Wednesday in October of that year was appointed by the General Court to "be kept as a day of publique Thanksgiving throughout the Colony," to recognize the divine favor in abating "the sore sickness," in sparing "so much of the fruits of the feild and trees as we enjoy," and various other similar blessings, which our fathers were not slow in recognizing as coming from the hand of God. The last Wednesday of November, of the same year,

was appointed to be observed as a day of fasting and prayer throughout the Colony. The reasons assigned were, some of them, "the dispensation of God towards his poore wilderness people * * * and particularly towards o'selves in this Colony the present year by reason of the generall sickness in most places, and more than ordinary in some, as allso excessive rains and floods in severall plantations, shortenuing us in our outward injoyments," and the fact that many congregations and Churches were bereaved of a settled ministry. [Col. Records 1678-89 pp. 131, 132.]

Before the Thanksgiving and the Fast Mr. Bradstreet was in his grave, and his pastorate had ended; not by the will of the people, but of God, after a ministry of seventeen years and a pastorate of thirteen years. As we have said, his decline in health began in 1680. The date of his death is nowhere given. But it can be approximately fixed. The last entry on the records of the Church, made by his hand, is as follows: "baptized August 12, 1683, Willian Potts his child Patience." November 19 of that year a vote of the town, to pay Mrs. Bradstreet the arrears of her deceased husband's salary, is recorded. Then his death must have occurred between the two dates, and not long after the earlier one, at the age of 43.

The cause of his death is nowhere stated. But his long decline, the fact that he inherited weakness of the lungs from his mother, who writes of herself on one occasion, "I fell into a lingering sickness like a consumption," and the fact that she finally died of this disease, justify the conclusion that he fell a victim to it in the prime and promise of his manhood.

No stone bears his name to mark the place of his burial. But Miss Caulkins well says "there can be no reasonable doubt that Mr. Bradstreet's remains were also deposited in that inclosure," the Town's Antientest Buriall Place. Miss Caulkins conjectures that his grave is covered by one of "two large, flat, granite stones, partly imbedded in the earth, near the center of the ground, which are supposed to have been laid as temporary memorials over the remains of some distinguished persons." If this conjecture cannot be proved, it cannot be disputed, and may be correct. At the time of his death it was difficult to procure engraved stones. Not long after, his family removed from New London. His house and lot were sold, and in due course of time his widow married Daniel Epes, of Ipswich, Mass. These facts help to explain the absence of a memorial slab to mark his grave.

A record of this pastorate would be incomplete without a personal sketch of the man himself. Be-

sides the journal from which we have quoted, he left what he entitled “Remembrances of the greatest changes in my Life.” From this, and from his journal, the following facts are obtained. He was the second son, not the eldest, as Miss Caulkins says, of Governor Simon Bradstreet, of Massachusetts. For he writes in his journal, “Sometime in August, 1682, my dear brother Mr. Sam^{ll} Bradstreet dyed in Jamaica. He was ye first born, ye greater ye breach in o^r family; but he is at rest in glory.” He writes in his “Remembrances,” “I was borne in N. England at Ipswitch, Septem. 28, being Munday, 1640. 1651 I had my education in the same Towne, at the Free School, the master of w^{ch} was my ever respected Friend, Mr. Ezekiel Cheevers. My father was removed from Ipsw. to Andover before I was putt to school, so yt my schooling was more chargeable. June 25, 1656, I was admitted to the Vniversity, Mr. Charles Chauncey being President. Anno 1660 I went out Bachelour of Artes and defended this Position, *Omnes Artes Accidentur Theologiae*. Anno 1663 I took my second degree, and went m^r of Artes, at w^{ch} time I defended this thesis, *Discrimen Boni et mali Cognoscitur a lege Naturae*. May 1, 1666, I came to New London at the desire of the people, and advise of my Freiuds, in order to a settlement in the ministry. The good Lord fitt me for that, or what other

service I may most glorify him in." Then follows the item, already quoted, which relates to and fixes the date of his ordination.

His marriage was another important event in his life. He was married October 2, 1667, at Newbury, Mass., to his cousin Lucy, the daughter of Rev. John Woodbridge, by his uncle, Maj. Gen. Daniel Denison. Mr. Woodbridge married his aunt ~~Lucy~~ ~~✓~~ Dudley, came to New England and settled at Newbury as a planter in 1634, and afterwards became a preacher, and was ordained as the first pastor of the North Church in Andover in 1645. Maj. Gen. Denison married his aunt Patience Dudley, came to Cambridge in 1633, soon after removed to Ipswich, and was Maj. General in 1653. As marriages were performed by civil magistrates, Gen. Denison officiated at the nuptials of his nephew and niece. Mrs. Bradstreet remained with her father at Newbury, to which he had returned after leaving his charge at Andover, till the spring of 1668, when, May 25, she accompanied her husband to New London. They boarded with Goodman Royse till September 3, when their house was ready to be occupied, and they began housekeeping.

Five children were the fruit of this marriage. The first was a son, born August 2, 1669, who died when but five days old. The next was Simon, who was

born March 7, and baptized March 12, 1670-1. When he was but three years old, he came near losing his life. Mr. Bradstreet thus records the fact in his "Remembrances: " "September 3, 1674, God was gratisly pleased to shew me mych mercy in saving my eldest child (Symon) from eminent danger, being fallen into a well (tho shallow) up to his very chin, w^rby had perished had not God's Provid^c ordered it so timely we mist him. Blessed God gine us hearts for euer to remember this, and to return vnto thee accordingly. Dear Symon if god giue yee life to read and vnderstand this, I charge thee to acknowledge it to god's praise and blesse his name for svch a Deliuer^c, that he did not cutt off thy life in ye bud. O yt thou mayest liue to know this and to walk answerably." Anne was the third child. She was born December 31, 1672, was baptized January 5, 1673, and died October 2, 1681, about two years before her father, and of the same disease. John was the fourth child, and third son. He was born November 3, 1676, and was baptized two days later. Lucy was the fifth child and second daughter. She was born October 24, 1680, and was baptized the thirty-first of the same month. She married Hon. Jonathan Remington of Cambridge, and died April 18, 1743, aged sixty-three.

Rev. Simon Bradstreet was of honorable descent.

Good blood ran in his veins. His grandfather was Rev. Simon Bradstreet of Horbling, England, was of a family of wealth, was a graduate of Cambridge and subsequently a fellow of Emanuel college of that university, and was a Puritan, known as "the venerable Mordecai of his country." His father was the Hon. Simon Bradstreet, who came to this country with Winthrop in 1630. He was chosen assistant to Winthrop before embarking, and continued in that office eighteen years. He was one of five to join the Church in Charlestown, on the first Sabbath in August, 1630. He was a strict Puritan, but voted against the extreme measures taken with the Salem witches, with the Quakers, with Ann Hutchinson, and with other offenders against the established order. He was deputy governor under Governor Leverett from 1673 to 1679, when he succeeded to the gubernatorial chair. With the exception of 1687 and 1688, which belonged to the iron rule of Sir Edmund Andros, he was yearly elected Governor of Massachusetts till May, 1692. When the news was received at Boston that William had arrived in England, and that James II had fled, the people arose, seized Andros, and put him in prison, and Simon Bradstreet, then eighty-seven years old, and the only survivor of the old Puritan leaders, was again made Governor. He died March 27, 1697, at the age of ninety-four. "He was a man

of deep discernment whom neither wealth nor honor could allure from duty. * * * Sincere in religion and pure in his life, he overcame and left the world." Such was the honored father of Rev. Simon Bradstreet of New London.

His mother was Ann Dudley, daughter of Thomas Dudley, the second Governor of Massachusetts. She was a woman of remarkable gifts, and of a poetical turn of mind. She was the earliest female poet in America. She published a volume of poems, the first to be published in this country, which went through several editions. She left also a volume in manuscript, dedicated to her son, Simon, containing twenty-seven Meditations Divine and Moral, of a most practical and serviceable nature. Thus "The finest wheat hath the least bran, the purest honey the least wax, and the sincerest Christian the least self-love;" "Downy beds make drowsy persons, but hard lodging keeps the eyes open; so a prosperous state makes a secure Christian, but adversity makes him consider." She died September 16, 1672, at about sixty years of age. Mr. Bradstreet makes this entry in his memoirs on that date: "My ever honoured and dear mother was translated to Heaven. Her death was occasioned by consvmpcion. * * * I being absent from her lost the opportunity of committing to memory her pious and memorable expressions vttered

in her sicknesse. O yt ye good Lord would giue vnto me and mine a heart to walk in her steps, considering what the end of her conversation was; yt so wee might one day haue a happy and glorious meeting." The Christian spirit of Ann Bradstreet left its stamp upon her son. Says Dr. Field, "it was the Christian spirit of this noble-minded woman, that, without doubt, contributed most of all to form the character of one of our first ministers, Simon Bradstreet." We must believe that the son of such parents, in a line of descencnt so conspicuous for its learning, its virtues, and its piety, inherited some of these rare qualities, and that, when he died a life of great promise was cut short.

Extracts from three letters are appended which were written to the Rev. Increase Mather of Boston by Mr. Bradstreet. The first is as follows :

"N. LONDON, April 20th, 1681.

REV^D SR. I think I never sent you my thanks for your last letter and your book against the Anabaptists, if not it is now time to doe it. I remember in your letter you say, that you doe not vnderstand of any in your parts against the Xtian Sabbath, I believe there are far more then you are aware of, and most Anabaptists I have known either deny it, or qvstion it. However, if thers was a fair opportunity, I think some elucubrations of that nature might bee of great vse; I am apt to think among good Christians there is not one in a hundred able to maintain the Xtian Sabbath with any strength. Their vsuall arg^{ts}, are, practices of the chhs & Xt's Resurrection, both of which are good & from both an idle sophister would drive them, & run them into a hundred absurdities. Three sheets

of paper, well filled by a dextrous & able hand to prove the change, under these three heads, *De licito*, that it may ; *De jure*, that it ought ; *De facto*, that it is ; I am apt to think would profit the world more then all Dr. Owen, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Hughes, etc., have written, tho: they deserve more then thankes for their paines. But I have forgot myself. Sr I have read your sermon, occasioned by the dreadful Comet, and now according to my wonted manner send to begge one (that I saw being only upon loan), haveing not hitherto mett with any repulse, which is no small encouragement to beggars. Whatever you print, I ever promise myself an interest in. You have made me so to believe.

ffor newes wee have the same you have, & as late as last Ffriday, by one that came then from Boston. I am not fond to believe what is said at present, if any strange reports should abuse or impose upon my reason, it is only because it is engraven with a pen of iron & the point of a diamond vpon my spirit (& has been so for severall yeares) that dreadfull times are coming upon our Nation in a speciall manner, tho: doubtless Calamityes enough upon all Christendom at least. ffor ourselves here, I am far from thinking wee shall bee at rest in the evil day, it was so formerly, but things were not then as they are now. I am sorry the great Conservators of your priviledges, &c. in the Bay, are m^{aking} rods for their own backs, & the backs of others. Some say my ffather is to be layd by this electⁿ as too great a friend to Caesar, not caring for or regarding the concerns of your R. publ, &c. I think they can not doe him a greater kindnes. God forbid the reines of that poor Colony should be under his hand. P. T. in the N. West, with others of the same complexion, that have skill to guide a plow-tail, may bee the fittest men to steer a C[ommon] Wealth. I well remember in Rome of old, some were fetchd from the plow to lead an army; & so vice versa, & why not as good now? It is plain wee need no enemyes to conspire our rvine. Our sins and follies will doe it too fast. Sr, pray let me vnderstand by the bearer what newes you have from England by private letters, &c. Perhaps some ships will bee arrived before his return, & please to comvnicate your thoughts of your own affaires, both with reference to

England and among your selves. I would fain know how that cursed Bratt Toleration is favored by your new Justices, & whether the old stand firm &c. I have made much inquiry but have had no satisfactory answer. Sr, I mvst not adde at present, but my own & wives hearty love & service to yourself & good cosen (to which pray giue the inclosed) hoping yov never forgett us for the best things in the best place. & so rest Dear Sir

Yours in great truth. S: BRADSTREET.

I am at present, I thank God, indifferent well, but far from well, God knowes, and whether I shall ever have the health I have had is with him who healeth all our diseases, who sends forth His word & does it. Mr. Fitch (of Norwich) is very infirm; has not preached many times this winter, not at all of late. If God should remove him it would bee a great blow to the Colony, & the ruine, almost, of that town. The death, sickness and infirmitiey of so many ministers has an awfull aspect with it. Sr. you will not forgett him in your prayers; —nor poor me, not to bee named with him."

In March or April, 1683, he wrote again, as follows:

“R^D & DEAR S^R —My weak hand (through my abiding indisposition) will not suffer me to write many lines. I received the verses and Almanacks you sent, and thank yourself & my cosen your sonne. I think his verses were in time and tune, and his Almanack too, only I must confesse I see (tho: I well know what is said by some) no religion in Hebrew moths nor irreligion in calling a vessell Castor & Pollux, &c. * * *

Sr. wee have no newes here but what comes from you, and some of it as to Cranfeild's motions, &c., hath an ill aspect, but I hope He that sits in Heaven will turn all such counsells into foolishnes. If wee can keep God our freind, no matter who are our enemies. But I fear this is our great wound; wee are making God our enemy, & that upon many accounts too long to write. I think now, if ever, it's time for N. E. especially for magistrates & Ministers to putt on all the armour of God, that they may stand in the evil day, & not to desert

152 EARLY HISTORY OF THE FIRST CHURCH.

or betray the cause they have so long espoused. Sir, I cannot adde at present but my own & wife's service to yourself & Cosen, with respects to my cosens your children, desiring your dayly remembrance of me in my weak & low estate, & so rest, Dear Sir.

Yours in much truth,

S. BRADSTREET.

S^r I hope you will send mee by the first your discoursse about Cometts with your Sermon upon the last Comett.

Please to keep the papers safe, I send, for if they obtain no *Imprimatur*, I have promised to return them.

S^r, The author of these papere is an Englishman, but born in France, & as he told me, he lived in Paris near twenty years before he knew any other place. I note this only that yov would excuse some words which are neither good French nor English."

The last letter is as follows :

"To the Rev^d Mr. Increase Mather, Teacher of a Ch^h of Christ in Boston :

N. LONDON, April 24, 83.

R^d & DEAR S^r, — Yours of April the 2d with the books to myself and Mr. Fitch and the letters, I received last night. I shall take the very first opportunity to send Mr. Ffitch his book & the letter. S^r. I am your great debtor, upon these accounts, & desire to bee so still. I believe this discourse you sent me will have as serious and solemn an influence upon those who read it, as many practicall Sermons in larger volu. I am glad Any putt it into your heart to spend some time on such a subject, & think you deserve more then thankes for the paines you have taken. * * * * *

Before this comes to your hands you will hear of the death of our governor. [William Leete, who died April 16, 1683, & was succeeded by Hon. Fitz-John Winthrop.] God is able to make up our losse, but our choice runs very low, both as to Governor, &c.

Sir, what you mention as to speciall providences in this Colony, &c., I suppose you have an account already. As to this pticular place, I could send you many things (having for many

years kept such a Journall), but many of them, and the most considerable, reflect so much upon surviving friends & relations, that I doe not account it prudent to meddle in them ; yet I purpose (if I live a few weeks) to send yov one or two (if not more) of very solemn providences in this place. My weaknes and hast of the messenger, will not suffer it now.

Sr, let me hear often from you, what newes you have, &c. As to evil times coming on vs, and the world, &c., I believe no two persons in the world are more agreed. Pray for me & mine.

I am yours,

S. B."

VII.

MEMBERSHIP FROM 1642 TO 1683.

The early membership of this Church is involved in as great obscurity as its origin. But the fact that there was a Church before 1670, implies that there were members before that date. The earliest known list was made October 5, 1670, and has been given in Chapter III. The aim of this chapter will be, to supplement this earliest list, by the names of those, who were manifestly members of the Church before that date, as we gather them from various sources.

All that we know about this early membership is obtained from contemporaries. For example, we know from the testimony of Johnson's Wonder-working Providence, that there were about fifty members at its organization in 1642. We know the names of some of these people, and have reason to believe that they were among the charter members of the Church. However, there is no official record, and we are therefore left to the evidence which contemporaries give for material to make a list of those who were members prior to October 5, 1670.

Nor do we know who were the chief promoters of the movement which resulted in the organization of this Church. It certainly would not be far wide of the mark to say that the men, who were prominent in town affairs in Gloucester and in Pequot, had a leading hand in bringing to pass its organization, with Richard Blinman as its pastor. Most, if not all, the original fifty members, whoever they were, followed their pastor to Pequot in 1651, or soon after. So that we know that it had about fifty members when it was transplanted from Gloucester to New London.

The diary of Thomas Miner speaks of certain persons as members and officers of the Church between 1651 and 1670. He also gives definite information concerning some who joined the Church within this period. An entry, made upon the records by Mr. Bradstreet, speaks of certain persons who were members of the Church, who had their children baptized before October 5, 1670. On that date he gives a list of persons who were then "of the Church of New London in full communion."

Let us begin with this list to prosecute our search. On it are the names of twenty-four persons who were members "of the Church now being, October 5, 1670;" from which we infer that they were members before that date. A subsequent entry states

that Lydia Bailey and Ruth Hill were received into the Church February 12, 1670. July 27 of the same year Thomas Miner records in his diary that Mr. Rice and William Hough were received into the Church. Mr. Hough's name is on Mr. Bradstreet's list. Then we know that at the time of Mr. Bradstreet's ordination, three other names should have been added to his list, unless Mr. Rice's connection with the Church had been discontinued; and we know that these twenty-seven were members before October 5, 1670.

Another entry upon the records of the Church reads, "the names of such as were children of the Church, *viz.*, of such as had been baptized before October 5, 1670, their parents, one or both being in full communion," at the time of the baptism. This entry proves conclusively that there were Church members in full communion before this date. Besides the children of Lieutenant James Avery, whose names are not given, is a list of "persons baptized from February 1, 1670." It is as follows: "Baptized February 12 these 18 persons. Goodwife Bailey," who on that day united with the Church, "and her children John, William; Mr. Pickett's children John, Mary, Ruth, Mercy, William; Mr. Hill's child Jane; Joshua Hempstead, Elizabeth, his wife, Phebe, his child; Joseph Morgan's wife Dorothy, her sister,

Alice Parker; James Avery's wife Deborah; Samuel Rogers, his children Samuel, Mary; the widow Bradley's daughter Lucretia; baptized February 19, 1670, four children of Goodwife Bailey's, Thomas, Mary, James, Joseph; baptized February 26, 1670, Jno. Henry's child Susanna." From this list we know that three of these were members of the Church before October 5, 1670, namely, Lieutenant James Avery, whose name is on Mr. Bradstreet's list, and Mrs. Bailey and Mrs. Hill, whose names are not on his list. Mrs. Hill was the widow of John Pickett, who died August 16, 1667. After his death his wife married Mr. Charles Hill. She joined the Church on the day when the children of Mr. Pickett and Mr. Hill were baptized, to which the rite of baptism was doubtless administered on her account. Joshua Hempstead and his wife joined the Church April 3, 1681. This and the case of Samuel Rogers are the only ones that can possibly be regarded as looking like the practice of the Half-way Covenant. But these were previous to Mr. Bradstreet's ordination, and he could not have administered the rite. Joseph Morgan's wife was Dorothy Parker, and she joined the Church June 28, 1671. From this list of baptisms of children, one or both of whose parents were in full communion, we have not only three who we know were members of the Church, but also several

whom we have a right to suppose were, although their names appear on no list, namely, Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Rogers, one or both, Mrs. Bradley, the daughter of Jonathan Brewster, and afterwards Mrs. Christopher Christophers, and Mr. and Mrs. John Henry, one or both. But as their membership cannot be established beyond a doubt, we shall not include them in the list which we are seeking to make of persons who were members previous to October 5, 1670.

On Wednesday, June 30, 1669, Thomas Miner wrote in his diary, "I was at New London and had testimony ffrom the church ffor me and my wife being owned to be under their watch." This testimony was signed on behalf of the Church by "James Averie and William Douglas." Then on that date Thomas Miner and his wife, James Avery and William Douglas, were members of this Church.

Again Mr. Miner writes, "thursday the 17 [of June 1658] Captaine Denison, mr. Stanton, goodman Cheesboro was heare to bid me come to a meeting." As Mr. Stanton, Captain Denison and Thomas Miner were among the charter members of the first Church in Stonington, we may conclude that they, with James Morgan and Mr. Cheesboro were members of this Church June 17, 1658. James Morgan and wife,

and Thomas Miner and wife are on the list of October 5, 1670.

Again Mr. Miner writes in his diary "thursday the 15 [January 1656-7] I was at Towne the day after the fast when we met about Captaine Denison and other recommended brethren and sisters and the leters came from Mr. Blackman and Mr. Fitch." These must have been letters of recommendation to this Church from Rev. Adam Blackman of Stratford, and Rev. James Fitch of Saybrook. Who the "other recommended brethren and sisters" were we do not know, but we do know, from Mr. Miner's diary, that they were received into the Church at that date.

As early as 1655 Thomas Park was a deacon of this Church. We may suppose that he was a member of it before that date. To his name I add the name of his wife, who was probably a sister of Mrs. Blinman, and the names of his father, Robert Park, and his mother. For a man, two of whose sons were deacons, would himself be likely to be a member of a Church. Robert Park's sons William of Roxbury, Mass., and Thomas of New Lenden, both held that office.

It will be rememberd that Thomas Miner says that, August 28, 1654, he was "sent for to be reconciled to the church," on account of his "rash speaking to Mr. Blinman." He states that the meeting was

held at the house of Goodman Caulkins, and that there were present the following, who constituted "the major part" of the Church, namely: "Mr. Blinman, Mr. Bruen, Goodman Morgan, Goodman Caulkins, Ralph Parker, Goodman Lester, Goodman Coit, Hugh Roberts, Captain Denison, and Goodman Cheeseboro," besides Thomas Miner himself. Then these eleven men, and doubtless their wives, were members of the Church August 28, 1654.

Then the following is a partial list of the members of this Church between 1651 and October 5, 1670. Besides the names given on Mr. Bradstreet's list [see chap. iii] are these: Mrs. Ruth Hill, Lydia Bailey, Goodman Rice, Thomas Stanton, George Denison, Goodman Cheeseboro, Obadiah Bruen, Goodman Caulkins, Goodman Coit, Goodman Lester, Hugh Roberts, Robert Park, Thomas Park, John Tinker, who was accustomed to hold deacon's meetings in the absence of the pastor; and those who were received by letter January 15, 1656-57, of whom there were at least four. If we add the wives of these men, as there is every reason for doing, the number of people who were members of this Church before October 5, 1670, but whose names do not appear on any list, was at least twenty-eight. Add to these Mr. Bradstreet's list, and we shall have at least fifty who were members of the Church between 1651 and the date when

that list was made. There is reason to believe that all the adults who came from Gloucester with Mr. Blinman, like Obadiah Bruen were members of the Church. In that case the membership before October 5, 1670, was much larger.

It was the way of the godly men and women of those times to connect themselves with the Church without delay. One of the first things which John Winthrop, Sr. did on arriving in this country was, to unite in forming a Church in Charlestown, Mass., of which he became a member. We believe that his son John Winthrop, Jr., followed his example and became a member of this Church. The early list, if it could be completed certainly, we believe, would be an illustrious one.

VIII.

THE HALF-WAY COVENANT.

During the period which this history covers, those religious forces, which affected the growth of the Churches of those early times, were beginning to make themselves felt. Among these forces was the Half-way Covenant. Its deleterious influence upon spiritual life, was so marked, especially in the period following 1683, that a brief statement of it seems a fitting introduction to what is to follow. Although the practice of it did not begin here until Mr. Saltonstall's pastorate, yet it was in the air, was a growing evil, was practiced by most of the leading Churches of the Colony, and was likely, as the sequel proved, to be adopted as the practice of this Church. It wrought havoc among the Churches, until, after more than a century, it ceased. Revivals were almost wholly unknown where it prevailed, and where revivals of power occurred it usually almost, if not altogether, disappeared. The two could not well exist together.

It well may be called the Connecticut plan. For the feeling in its favor was specially strong through-

out this Colony. It practically had its beginning in Hartford. Its first most violent outbreak was in a quarrel over a successor to Thomas Hooker, which lasted for several years. It "finally resulted in the withdrawal of a number of members of that Church, and the formation of a new settlement at Hadley, Mass." Clark, in his *Congregational Churches of Massachusetts*, says that Rev. John Russell, of Wethersfield, took strong ground against the new way, and, in carrying out his views, was reprimanded by the magistrates for alleged irregularity in excommunicating a member of his Church. Differences arose which resulted in his going, with many of his flock, and with some from Hartford, to Hadley. In writing about it to Governor Winthrop, June 14 [24], 1666, John Davenport, whom Dr. Bacon styles "the stiff old Congregationalist," said, "I feel at my heart no small sorrows for the public divisions and distractions at Hartford. Were Mr. Hooker now *in vivis*, it would be as a sword in his bones that the Church which he planted there should be thus disturbed by innovations brought in and urged so vehemently by his young successor in office, not in spirit; who was so far from these lax ways that he opposed the baptizing of grandchildren by their grandfathers' right." "But he is at rest; and the people there grow woefully divided, and the better sort are ex-

ceedingly grieved, while the looser and worser party insult, hoping that it will be as they would have it, viz., that the plantation shall be brought into a parish way, against which Mr. Hooker hath openly borne a strong testimony in print. The most of the churches in this jurisdiction [the old New Haven Colony] are professedly against this new way, both in judgment and practice, upon gospel grounds, namely, New Haven, Milford, Stratford, Branford, Guilford, Norwalk, Stamford, and those nearer to Hartford, namely, Farmington and the sounder portion of Windsor, together with their reverend pastor, Mr. Warham, and I think Mr. Fitch and his church also." It is likely that Mr. Davenport suspected that his friend, the Governor, favored the innovation. At any rate the next year, in 1667, he accepted a call to the First Church in Boston, where a large majority favored his views; for after the union of New Haven with Connecticut he was unwilling to remain, because these new, and as he believed, loose practices prevailed. For a similar reason Abraham Pierson, of Branford, and a majority of his people removed to Newark, N. J., in the spring of 1666. The Stratford Church was divided by a quarrel over the same subject, and the result was the planting of a new town at Woodbury. The calling of Mr. Davenport to Boston resulted in the division of the First Church there. Twenty-

eight male members withdrew, who, by the aid of an *ex parte* council, formed what has long been known as The Old South, May 12, 1669. These facts are given to show how high the spirit of controversy ran ; and it was especially strong in Connecticut. It grew stronger and waxed more hot till, as Dr. Bacon says [Eccl. Hist. of Conn., p. 29], “gradually the Churches, weary of contention, fell into the new way for the sake of peace.” There are no records except the list of baptisms and the list of admissions, to show the attitude of this Church upon this question. But when the pastorate of Mr. Saltonstall began, we find that the new way had gained a foothold.

This new way was known as the Presbyterian way. The Churches were gathered in New England upon the theory of “the personal regenerate character of all the members,” which was known as the Congregational way. Thomas Hooker stated this way in these words, “visible saints only are fit matter appointed by God to make up a visible church of Christ.” It was at this point that the Puritans and Separatists took issue with the prevailing ecclesiastical system of England. The new way, says Dr. Bacon, “was old in the old world but new in New England. It was the system of all national churches, and therefore of the Presbyterian party in the Long Parliament and the Westminster Assembly. It was what Davenport

called the 'Parish way'—a system under which the local church, as a covenanted brotherhood of souls renewed by the experience of God's grace, was to be merged in the parish; and all persons of good moral character living within parochial bounds, were to have, as in England and Scotland, the privilege of baptism for their households, and access to the Lord's Table." [Eccl. Hist. of Conn., pp. 28, 29.] It is to be understood that this refers to persons who laid no claim to regenerate character. It was a complete setting aside of Christ's declaration that, unless men are born again they can not enter the kingdom of God. Says Dr. George Leon Walker, "all the baptized persons of an English, German, or Genevan Parish, were accounted members of the there existing church, even if manifestly destitute of Christian character." This was the abuse from which our fathers fled to these shores, to set up here a state, and a church, in which only men of avowedly Christian experience and character should have a voice. It obliterated, so they believed, all distinction between the Church and the world. It did not come over on the *Mayflower*. It was a later importation. It so seriously threatened the Churches that, in 1668, the legislature of Connecticut appointed four ministers, James Fitch of Norwich, Gershom Bulkeley of Wethersfield, Joseph Eliot of Guilford, and Samuel Wakeman of Fair-

field, to meet at Saybrook, “ to consider of some expedient for our peace, by searching out the rule, and thereby clearing up how far the Churches and people may walk together within themselves, and one with another, in the fellowship and order of the Gospel, notwithstanding some various apprehensions among them in matters of discipline respecting membership and baptism.” At least Mr. Bulkeley was for the “ Presbyteriall way,” while Mr. Fitch, and Mr. Eliot were for the “ Congregational way.” Their report, which they made in 1669, was one of those compromises which aggravated rather than allayed the controversy. After this the legislature did not meddle with the matter. Time wrought a change which brought peace, because the new way won the field.

This controversy grew up in a most natural manner. Parents, who were in full communion in the Church, offered their children in baptism, in the full belief that they were included in the covenant. Nor were they without warrant of Scripture for this view. The promises included the children ; so did the old covenant. So does the new. John Cotton said, “ the same covenant which God made with the National Church of Israel and their seed, it is the very same * * * which the Lord maketh with any Congregational Church and our seed.” That is, the children

of believers, who were in the Church, received the rite of baptism because they were considered as within the Church, under its watch and care, and entitled to it. As early as the organization of the First Church in Salem, in 1629, Mr. Higginson of Salem, and Mr. Brewster of Plymouth "did agree in their judgements, viz. concerning the church-membership of children with their parents, and that baptism was a seal of their membership." This view was further confirmed by the Synod of June, 1657, which held that the Church had a certain watch and care over those who had received this seal, but were not in full communion. "It is the duty of infants who confederate in their parents, when grown up unto years of discretion, though not yet fit for the Lord's Supper, to own the covenant they made with their parents, by entering thereinto in their own persons; and it is the duty of the church to call upon them for the performance thereof; and if being called upon, they shall refuse the performance of this great duty, or otherwise do continue scandalous, they are liable to be censured for the same by the church." [Cong. Chs. of Mass., p. 71.] There are several entries upon our records which read like a compliance with this decision, and from which it seems that the Church exercised the right of discipline in the case of men and women not in full communion. Only on their

coming to adult age, and upon approbation of their fitness, persons owned the covenant, professed faith in Christ, were received into full relations, and were admitted to the Lord's Supper. This view of the church membership of baptized children was advocated as lately as 1844, in an elaborate treatise by Rev. William A. Stearns, then pastor of the Evangelical Congregational Church, Cambridgeport, Mass., and afterwards President of Amherst College. These baptized children of parents, who were in full communion, were held to be in the Church by a kind of apostolic succession ; but not in it in full communion, so as to be admitted to its full privileges, till they could claim experience of the new birth, and had made full public confession of their faith.

At this point the theory seemed to some to prove more than was claimed or even admitted by those who held it. Hence arose the controversy which dragged its length through more than a century of the ecclesiastical life of New England. For the question naturally arose whether such persons, who had received the sign and seal of their church membership, in the rite of baptism, at the hands of their parents who were in full communion, had the right to present their own children for baptism. A further question also arose, whether such persons, being in the Church by their birth and baptism, should also

have a right to come to the Lord's Table, without being able to claim the experience of the new birth, provided they lived orderly and outwardly correct lives. If they might have the privilege of the one Sacrament, why not of the other also? The step was not far to the question why they should not be entitled to a vote in the affairs of the Church. It was finally decided, however, by the convention of June 4, 1657, that persons who were come to maturity, ought "to own the covenant they made with their parents, by entering thereinto in their own persons." "Yet it was decided that while the children of those thus owning the covenant ought to be admitted to baptism, they themselves ought not to come to the Lord's Table, nor vote in Church affairs, till they had made a profession of personal regeneration." [Dunning.] Instead of allaying strife the result of this council tended to foment, and prolong it. It is not our purpose to call the logic of this conclusion in question. But it is difficult to see, if the one point of baptism were yielded, why the other points would not follow, and why those, who might have their children baptized, might not also, for the same reason, come to the Lord's Table, and have a voice in the affairs of the Church. In fact, such came to be the result in many cases, to the great damage of the Churches, which became filled with members utterly lacking in

spiritual life and Christian character. The finding, or rather compromise decision, of 1657, was letting down the first bar. The others came down in succession, till often, regenerated character, was not required as essential to church membership; only an outwardly correct life. The battle of Unitarianism in the nineteenth century began to be fought during the last half of the seventeenth century.

The controversy waxed hotter and hotter, nor did it cease till it claimed, and in many cases secured, full Church privileges for those who were the baptized children of the Church, without exacting of them the usual Christian experience. They formed a kind of third estate. They were exemplary in their lives; they helped support the gospel; why should they not come to the Lord's Table, have a voice in the affairs of the Church, express their minds in the calling of a pastor, etc? The feeling grew so strong that in 1662 "the fourth Synod, which met at Boston, passed a vote which reaffirmed and commended the crude expedient of the Half-way Covenant" [Dr. Bacon]; that is, on presenting their children for baptism, they were to make a certain public confession of Christian faith and obedience, which was not to be understood as implying a Christian experience or change of heart. The discussion never came to a definite decision. Churches were left to decide their-

own internal practice. But lines of cleavage were drawn. In 1707 Rev. Solomon Stoddard, of Northampton, Mass., the grandfather of Jonathan Edwards, preached a sermon in which he took ground that "the Lord's Supper is a converting ordinance." The sermon provoked sharp and unfavorable discussion and comment. In reply he published his "Appeal to the Learned; being a Vindication of the Right of Visible Saints to the Lord's Supper, though they be destitute of a Saving Work of God's Spirit on their Hearts." These "visible saints" were the offspring of Christian parents, who had received the rite of baptism, and inherited the relation of sonship toward God. There are abundant evidences that this Stoddardian plan was partially at work in this Church before it was promulgated by Mr. Stoddard, in the case of those who would "conform their outward conduct to the accepted rules of Christian morality." Says Dr. Bacon, "silently, widely, and for at least a quarter of a century the practice had preceeded the public vindication of it."

The Churches, which were thus increased in membership by the admission of persons who laid no claim to regenerate character, grew lax in discipline. The morals of a community often sank to so low an ebb that offences against social purity were not infrequent. Into the pulpits came men who could lay

small claim to a spiritual experience, even if they had been converted. Fruit was borne in a scheme of justification by works. The cleavage which split the Churches of New England asunder in the early part of this century began in the practices of the last half of the seventeenth century.

The baptismal question was a burning one. It was, in fact, paramount to every other. So much stress was laid on it that men, who were not ready to take the vows of God upon them, esteemed this sign and seal of the covenant as of the utmost importance to their children, and they were willing to go half-way to secure it for them ; forgetting that the ordinance means nothing, and secures nothing for the subject, unless the believing faith of the parent accompanies the act of consecration. The practice of infant baptism seems to have been more general than in some later periods, in which the people of God seem to have forgotten that the children were included in the covenant.

The spiritual conditions were not favorable to the promotion of deep personal piety, nor of revivals of religion. There were no awakenings in this Church, nor, indeed, in New England, worth mention, before 1740. “ Into these conditions the preaching of Jonathan Edwards came as a purifying stream from a divine fountain.” [Dunning.] Their effect on this

Church may be seen in the fact that during the first half century of its existence in New London not over two hundred were received into its membership, and that a full century of its life passed without a religious awakening.

This appropriately introduces to the next pastorate, in which we shall find the Half-way Covenant in full practice.

IX.

THE ROGERENES.

As we have seen, the Rogerene movement began in New London during the ministry of Mr. Bradstreet. But it became a prominent religious factor in the ministry of Mr. Saltonstall. Its doctrines and practices were more sharply defined, and began to take deeper root and to assert themselves more positively. As it was the first break in the unity of religious thought and worship in New London, and as its originators and adherents so vitally affected the life of the Church during the ministry of Mr. Saltonstall, a brief account of this sect may be given as a further introduction to his pastorate.

The originator of the family in New London, whose name the movement came to bear, was James Rogers. He came to America, it is supposed, in 1635, when twenty years of age. He settled in Stratford, and afterward at Milford, where he joined the Church in 1652. He came to New London between 1656 and 1660. He joined this Church by letter from the Church in Milford in 1670, soon after Mr.

Bradstreet's ordination. He soon acquired large property, and exerted considerable influence in both civil and ecclesiastical affairs. He built a house of stone on that part of Mr. Winthrop's house-lot which was next the Old Town Mill. Mr. Winthrop's deed fixes the location. It is found in Book III, p. 124, of the ancient Town Records, is dated May 13, 1660-61, and reads as follows:

“ Know all men by these presents that I John Winthrop for lawfull considerations to me thereunto moving do give, grant, alienate, confirm and make over unto James Rogers of New London, bisket Baker, that part or parcel of ground on which his house in New London now stands containing also the [illegible] and garden plat joining to said house as now lay excepting only a sufficient landing-place and way, or passage which is left common that to go to and from the grist mill by land and water, this said way [now known as Mill street] being the boundary to said ground thus given towards the west, my own land without the garden and lot to be the bounds eastward. The street [now known as Winthrop street] between my orchard and the said grounds the bounds next northward, the mill cove or creek the bounds to the southward.”

That is, the town dwelling of James Rogers stood on the piece of ground between Winthrop street and the cove and east of Mill street. The Winthrops afterwards bought the ground back. The deed makes impossible the view stated, by Miss Caulkins, that Mr. Rogers lived on the spot where the Winthrop school now stands.

Mr. Rogers, as the deed specified, was a baker. He did business on a large scale. He furnished biscuit

for seamen, and for the colonial troops. Between 1660 and 1670 he had a greater interest in the trade of this port than any other person in the town. He had large landed estates on Great Neck, at Mohegan, several house lots in town, and a large tract of land on the east side of the river.

He had a numerous progeny, descending from his five sons, who were progenitors of as many distinct lines. But we are more immediately concerned with his third son, John, who was the direct founder of the sect which still bears his ancestral name. In 1670 this John married Elizabeth, the daughter of Matthew Griswold. In 1674 he and his brother James embraced Sabbatarian views, and were immersed. Jonathan followed in 1675, and the father, James, with his wife and daughter Bathsheba, in 1676. They became dissenters from the Congregational order and joined the Seventh Day Church in Newport. The elder James was an upright and circumspect man. He died February 1687-8.

As the government of Andros was paramount in New England at the time, his will was probated in Boston. It was a simple document, expressing the wish that his children should not contend over his property. "What I have of this world I leave among you, desiring you not to fall out or contend about it; but let your love one to another appear more than to the

estate I leave with you, which is but of this world." A later part of the document says, "if any difference should arise, &c., my will is that there shall be no lawing among my children before earthly judges, but that the controversy be ended by lot, and so I refer to the judgement of God, and as the lot comes forth, so shall it be." This irenic desire of the father was not met, for the children were soon engaged in a bitter controversy respecting boundaries, in which "earthly judges" were obliged to interfere.

His will further says, "and for your comfort I signify to you that I have a perfect assurance of an interest in Jesus Christ and an eternal happy state in the world to come, and do know and see that my name is written in the book of life."

In 1677, on account of some differences with certain elders of the Seventh Day Church, from Rhode Island, John Rogers withdrew from the Sabbatarians, and advanced notions of his own. He assumed, and performed, the ministerial offices of baptizing and preaching. He gained a few disciples, and formed a new sect, who were called Rogerenes, Rogerene Quakers, or Rogerene Baptists—Rogerenes, because they were followers of John Rogers; Quakers, because some of their beliefs were in harmony with those of the Friends; Baptists, because they were immersionists.

In respect to most of the Christian doctrines they were orthodox. They held to salvation by faith in Jesus Christ, to the Trinity, to the necessity of the new birth, to the resurrection of the just and the unjust, and to an eternal judgment. One of their peculiarities was an evident determination to be persecuted. By their defiance of the laws of the Colony, they constantly made themselves liable to fines and imprisonment, and when punished for their misdemeanors they called it persecution. They maintained obedience to civil magistrates in all but matters of conscience and religion. A town rate they would pay without remonstrance, but they rebelled against being taxed for a minister's salary. They regarded all days alike, and so were brought into conflict with the statutes of the Colony which required the observance of Sunday. For while they often met for religious services, on the first day of the week, when their service was ended they felt free to labor as on other days. They had no houses set apart for public worship. They regarded a church-tower, a pulpit, a cushioned pew, a church, a salaried minister in a black suit of clothes, with peculiar aversion. They did not believe in taxation for the support of the institutions of religion ; nor in administering civil oaths ; nor in prayer on public occasions or in the family ; nor in the use of the voice in prayer, unless, on special occa-

sions, the Spirit of God within should move one to audible prayer ; nor in the use of medicines as means for the recovery of health ; nor in any civil or religious rite in marriage.

An account of the marriage of John Rogers and Mary Ransford will best state their views as to the proper method of entering into this holy alliance. His first wife, Elizabeth Griswold, had left him, a divorce having been granted her by the legislature. After living alone twenty-five years, he married himself to his maid servant, and on this wise. He would not be married by any minister or magistrate. So he hit upon the following course of procedure, as described by his son : "They agreed to go into the County Court and there declare their marriage ; and accordingly they did so ; he leading his bride by the hand into court, where the judges were sitting, and a multitude of spectators present ; and then desired the whole assembly to take notice, that he took that woman to be his wife ; his bride assenting to what he said, whereupon the judge (Wetherell) offered to marry them in their form, which he refused, telling them that he had once been married by their authority, and by their authority they had taken away his wife again, and rendered him no reason why they did it. Upon which account he looked upon their form of marriage to be of no value, and therefore he

would be married by their form no more. And from the court he went to the governor's house (Fitz-John Winthrop's) with his bride, and declared their marriage to the governor, who seemed to like it well enough, and wished them much joy, which is the usual compliment." This strange scene they called marriage. It serves to show their views and practices, and how they were accustomed to set common law at defiance, and make themselves liable to its penalties. Certainly such proceedings would not be tolerated now, and it does not seem that they were persecuted simply because they were required to conform their conduct to the laws of the Colony.

Not only did they hold peculiar views, and indulge in unlawful practices, but they meant that others should know it. They resorted to various ways of showing their contempt for the regular ministry. It is said that John Rogers once met Dr. Lord at the door of his meeting house in Norwich Town, and accosted him, as he took off his hat and displayed the ministerial wig, with these words, "Benjamin, Benjamin, dost thou think that they wear white wigs in heaven?" On another occasion he sent a wig to a contribution made in aid of the ministry. For this offence he made this candid apology, which is found in the town book :

“Whereas I John Rogers of New London did rashly and unadvisedly send a perewigg to the contribution of New London, which did reflect dishonor upon that which my neighbors ye inhabitants of New London account the ways and ordinances of God and ministry of the word to the greate offence of them, I doe hereby declare that I am sorry for sayde action and doe desire all those whom I have offended to accept this my publique acknowledgement as full satisfaction. 27th, 1:91.

JOHN ROGERS.”

It was contempt cast upon Mr. Saltonstall for which this ample apology was made.

But the regret expressed was only a temporary emotion. For he resumed almost immediately his career of offence. He and his followers felt bound to dissent from the established order, from the commonly received opinions and practices, and from the express statutes of the Colony, and that too in a way to bring upon themselves the force of the law. In 1676 the fines and imprisonments of James Rogers and his sons for profanation of the Sabbath began. For this and similar offences they, and some of their followers were fined repeatedly, the fine being at first five shilling, then ten, then fifteen. At the June session of the court in 1677 seven persons were fined £5. In September the court ordered that John Rogers be called to account every month, and fined £5 each time. Others of the family were dealt with in a similar way for blaspheming the Sabbath, and for calling it an idol, and for stigmatizing the clergy-

men as hirelings. Later to these fines was added the punishment of sitting in the stocks and whipping.

Not only did they disregard the Sabbath and God's express command to keep one seventh of time holy, they also were determined that others should not observe holy time in peace. Dr. McEwen says that they regarded worship, performed on the Lord's Day, as a species of idolatry which they felt called upon to oppose. They felt it to be their special mission to destroy priesthood. So they used a variety of means to disturb those who were assembled for worship on the Christian Sabbath. They were accustomed to enter places of worship in a rude and boisterous way; to engage in various sorts of manual labor, such as sewing or knitting, during the service, in order to interrupt it. They sometimes came to church and behaved in a most unbecoming manner. They would often rise up in worshipping assemblies and interrupt the preacher and call him a hireling, accuse him of making merchandise of the flock, telling the people that they were sunk in the mire of idolatry, and entangled in the net of Antichrist, and calling the preacher a liar, if he said anything which they did not believe. They even went so far as to rush into church and interrupt the preacher to declare their violations of the laws respecting the keeping of holy time. Bathsheba Fox, a sister of John Rogers,

went openly to church to proclaim that she had been doing servile work on the Christian Sabbath. John Rogers went with her, and interrupted the preacher to proclaim a similar offence. On one occasion he trundled a wheel-barrow into the porch of the church during divine service. For this he was arrested, set in the stocks and imprisoned. Probably this was the very thing which he sought to bring upon himself as his testimony against what he called the errors of the times. While held in durance he hung out of his window a board which had the following proclamation:

“I, John Rogers, a servant of Jesus Christ, doth here make an open declaration of war against the great red dragon, and against the beast to which he gives power; and against the false church that rides upon the beast: and against the false prophets who are established by the dragon and the beast; and also a proclamation of derision against the sword of the devil’s spirit, which is prisons, stocks, whips, fines and revilings, all which is to defend the doctrines of devils.”

This would all have been harmless, if these people had not so persistently crowded their sentiments upon the attention of others in a way not to be disregarded. Thus on the next Sunday after writing the above, being allowed the privilege of the prison limits, he rushed into the meeting house during the service, and with great noise and violence denounced the minister and the worship. For this offence Mr. Rogers was taken to Hartford jail. The document

providing for his removal was dated March 28, 1694, and is as follows:

“Whereas John Rodgers of New London hath of late set himself in a furious way in direct opposition to the true worship and pure ordinances, and holy institutions of God, as also on the Lord’s day passing out of prison in the time of public worship, running into the meeting house in a railing and raging manner, as being guilty of blasphemy ;”

and more to the same effect, setting forth the reasons for more rigorous dealing with the offender. At Hartford he was tried, fined £5 for disturbing public worship, required to give bond of £50 not to repeat the offense, and was seated upon the gallows fifteen minutes with a halter round his neck. He refused to pay the fine or give the bond, and was remanded to jail, where he was kept till the whole length of his imprisonment was three years and eight months. During his term of confinement an attack was made upon the government of the Colony by several of his followers, reciting that “to compel people to pay for a Presbyterian minister is against the laws of England; is rapine, robbery and oppression.” The remonstrants paid for this attack at the rate of £5 each.

These people were dealt with with rigorous severity. But what was the magistrate to do who was sworn to keep the peace ? And what shall be said of their violent and disorderly conduct, in defiance of

the rights of the community? They felt the heavy hand of the law, but they had themselves principally to thank. Their right to hold their peculiar views was not questioned, nor were they punished for holding them.

It is said by his followers that John Rogers, after embracing the views which he preached, made himself so obnoxious to the colonial statutes by his manner of advocating them, that he spent nearly one-third of his life in prison. Writing in 1706 he said : “I have been sentenced to pay hundreds of pounds, laid in iron chains, cruelly scourged, endured long imprisonments, set in the stocks many hours together, &c.” His son states that his father’s sufferings continued for more than forty-five years, and adds, “I suppose that the like has not been known in the kingdom of England for some ages past.” There can be no doubt that unreasonable severity was shown to this man and his followers. Thus he was fined £5 “for unlawfully rebaptizing,” and was publicly “whipped fifteen lashes” for creating disturbances on the Lord’s day in worshipping assemblies of such a violent nature that several women fainted away. The offence was great; the punishment was severe. Neither could happen now.

John Rogers was a strong man. He believed what he believed with a strong conviction. The steadfast-

ness with which he and his followers clung to their beliefs, even though we regard them as fanatical, can not but elicit our admiration. But the difficulty was that they refused to render obedience to the laws, and refused to respect the rights of others to hold their beliefs in peace, and be protected in the exercise of their privileges. Their views made them a disturbing element in the community, and nothing was left for the magistrate to do but to punish their misdemeanors. It was, doubtless, a mistake for the early settlers of New England to compel conformity to an established ecclesiastical order; the very evil which they had left England to escape. It is likely, too, that in these days much of the offending of the Rogerenes would have been passed over without notice. It may be, too, that prejudice and rumor exaggerated their offences. But be that as it may, they were a part of the civil order which they were bound to regard.

These people were not punished for their beliefs, but because, as Trumbull says, they took pains to disturb Christian assemblies, and deprived others of their right to worship God in their own way. Mr. Saltonstall may have been more uniformly rigorous than other magistrates. But he tried to persuade them to desist from molesting the worship of their neighbors, and offered them generous terms which

would have secured liberty of conscience and conviction to them, and lasting peace to the community. Says John Bolles, "he gave his word that to persuade us to forbear, if we would be quiet, and worship God in our own way according to our consciences, he would punish any of their people that should disturb us in our worship." When it is said that Mr. Saltonstall was rigorous in his dealings with offenders, it should also be remembered that these people refused his proposition to secure to them the same rights of worship and belief which others enjoyed, on the simple condition that they would desist from molesting the worship of those who differed from them. They refused all compromise, and insisted on pursuing their riotous methods. It was not their fault if Mr. Saltonstall's pastorate was not a stormy one. The reputation which he had for austerity of manner and severity of spirit, was partly due to the rigorous measures to which the riotous behavior of the Rogerenes drove him.

John Rogers was in trouble, and kept every one else in trouble who had any dealings with him, till he died, October 17, 1721. He was buried on his Mamacock farm, on the banks of the Thames. The sect which he founded has always had its home in New London county. It is said that their numbers have remained about the same as at the beginning to

this day. The violent opposition to the established order which they manifested at the first seemed to subside after the death of their founder. With the exception of a year and a half during the ministry of Mather Byles, they seem to have lived peaceably with all men. Their bitter hatred of a paid ministry, and of houses of worship which were peculiar to Rogerenes two centuries ago, are no longer true of them. The principal society now is in Ledyard. The following is from the pen of Rev. John Avery, who was pastor in Ledyard, and speaks from personal knowledge :

“The Rogerene Quakers have for many years lived in the southeast part of Ledyard, and have there constituted a community quite isolated in some respects from the people dwelling about them. They have their own views of religion, their own meeting house, their own modes of worship, their own Sabbath school, and their own ways of doing things generally. They are in the main industrious, peaceable and honest, and inclined to let other people have their own ways, provided that other people will let them have theirs. Formerly they refused to have anything to do with politics ; refused to go to the polls to vote ; refused to pay taxes ; refused to bear arms. Some of these peculiarities have in recent years been partially laid aside.

“In the War of the Rebellion some of their young men enlisted as soldiers, and several laid down their lives in their country’s service. The children are now educated in the public schools, and several of the young people have become successful teachers. Quite a number of their young men, and young women, too, have married into other than Quaker families. The result of this has been that considerable numbers have, in a measure, at least, broken away from the Quaker faith.

"The old-time prejudice against churches and ministers, though still retained by some, is slowly wearing off with the rising generation. Whenever a marriage ceremony is to be celebrated, generally a clergyman is called in to officiate. At funerals also a minister of the gospel is generally requested to take charge of the service. They are strongly opposed to war, and have for many years been putting forth strenuous efforts to promote universal peace among men." * * *

This modern picture of these people presents them in a far different and more winsome light than the history of their earlier years.



X.

GURDON SALTONSTALL'S PASTORATE.

Nov. 25, 1691—Jan. 1, 1708.

The interval between the death of Mr. Bradstreet, and the coming of Mr. Saltonstall, was occupied with attempts to secure a pastor. A committee was appointed November 19, 1683 as follows: “Voted that Major John Winthrop, Major Edward Palms, Capt. James Avery, Mr. Daniel Wetherell, Mr. Christo Christophers, Tho. Beebe, Joseph Coite, John Prentis Sen^r, Clemeant Miner, Charles Hill, are appointed a committee in behalf of the town to send a letter to Capt. Wayte Winthrop to the reverend Mr. Mather and Mr. Woppard [Willard] ministers at Boston for there advice and counsell in attayneing a minister for the towne to supply the place of Mr. Bradstreet deceased, and that sd Capt. Winthrop shall have instructions from the sd committee to manadge that affaire wth them.” Not until June of the following year was their quest successful, when the committee reported that they had secured the services of Mr. Edward Oakes of Cambridge, Mass. The

town voted to approve the acts of the committee, and to give Mr. Oakes a salary of £100 a year "for so long a time as he and they could agree together." Probably this was the Edward Oakes, who graduated from Harvard college in the class of 1679, and who was the son of Rev. Uriah Oakes, who had been president of the college. He preached here about a year, and steps were taken towards his settlement. But the people were not unanimous in their desire to have him remain, and he left the Church and the town. It is said that he died young; probably not long after his departure from New London.

In September, 1685, shortly after Mr. Oakes had gone, the committee secured the services of Mr. Thomas Barnet. He soon arrived on the ground with his family, and entered upon his duties. So satisfactory were his services that, in November of that year, the town voted to accept his ministry. Again December 26th the following vote was passed: "Mr. Thomas Barnet by full consent none contradicting was accepted by the inhabitants to be their minister." In other words he received an unanimous call to be the pastor of the Church. The vote continues, "Major John Winthrop is chosen to appear as the mouth of the Town to declare their acceptance of Mr. Barnet." "The time for ye solemnity of Mr. Barnet's admittance to all ministerial offices is left to the

direction of Mr. Barnett and the townsmen to appoint the day." For some unknown reason he was never ordained, and his ministry here, after a brief period came to an end. His name does not appear again on the records, save in a bill for sixteen shillings, presented by Jonathan Prentis, "for going with Mr. Barnett to Swansea." Why an arrangement which promised so well, and was so mutually satisfactory, fell through, is nowhere explained. He was an English clergyman, and, like Mr. Peters and Mr. Blinman, had been ejected from his living, and driven from England for non-conformity, by the rigorous measures which followed the restoration of the house of Stuart to the throne. Like Mr. Peters he may have been recalled to England. This would explain his sudden departure from New London. His ministry extended into 1686, and may have occupied a considerable portion of it.

June 22, 1687, the town was again assembled to deliberate upon the question of the "best ways and means for procuring an able minister of the gospel." A committee of seven, with Hon. Fitz-John Winthrop at its head, was chosen. After a few months they secured the services of Mr. Gurdon Saltonstall, a young man, of great promise, who had graduated from Harvard college three years and a half before. This young man came to New London upon the invi-

tation of the committee, and preached during the winter of 1687-8 with so great acceptance that he soon won all the hearts and votes of the people. Consequently in May, 1688, he received an unanimous request, by vote of the town, to continue among them in the work of the ministry. That is, he received a call to settle in the pastorate of the Church. They promised to give him due encouragement; which doubtless meant ample pecuniary support. The amount of the salary is not given, but it was probably not less than had been paid his predecessor—"£120 a year in provision pay."

The call was accepted. For the town voted that "on his return from Boston, whither he is shortly going, they will proceed to have him ordained." For some unknown reason his ordination did not take place till November 25, 1691. The interval between this event and the death of Mr. Bradstreet, in August, 1683, was over eight years. But he continued to preach after he came till he was ordained, so that the actual interval between the two ministries was but a little over four years. His ministrations met with universal acceptance, as appears from the fact that the vote of May, 1688, accepting his ministry, or calling him to the pastorate, was repeated June 7, 1689. Evidently the reason for delay in his ordination was with himself. For August 25, 1691, at a

town-meeting, at which sixty-five persons, who were heads of families, were present, the votes of 1688 and 1689 were reaffirmed, and a committee was appointed to make arrangements with Mr. Saltonstall for his ordination, and it was "voted that Hon. Major General John Winthrop is to appear as the mouth of the Town at Mr. Saltonstall's ordination, to declare the Town's acceptance of him to the ministry."

In the records of the Church is this entry, "Nov. 19, '91, G. Saltonstall was received into this Church." He is the only pastor whose name appears on its list of members, till Rev. Edward W. Bacon. Six days later, November 25, the following minute was entered on the records in Mr. Saltonstall's hand, "The records of the Church kept by G. Saltonstall from Nov. 25, 1691, who was on that day ordained minister there by Mr. Eliot and Mr. Timothy Woodbridge." Rev. Joseph Eliot, of Guilford, and Rev. Timothy Woodbridge, of Hartford, are probably the men referred to. Thus at the age of twenty-six years, lacking four months, Gurdon Saltonstall became pastor of the First Church, which office he held and filled with great ability till he was chosen Governor to succeed his distinguished parishioner, the Hon. Fitz-John Winthrop.

He filled so large a place, and was so conspicuous a figure in the history of this Church, the town and

the Colony, that we may pause here to enquire who he was and from whom he was descended. His great-grandfather was Richard Saltonstall, Sr., who was born at Halifax, England, in 1586, and was nephew of Sir Richard Saltonstall, who was at one time Lord Mayor of London. He was also one of the original patentees of the Connecticut Colony, of which his great-grandson was to be Governor. He came to Massachusetts with John Winthrop, Sr., as his assistant, in 1630. He returned to England the next year, where he filled several important positions under the Crown. In 1644 he was sent as an ambassador to Holland. In 1649 he was one of the judges of the court which passed sentence of death upon the Duke of Hamilton, Lord Capel and others for high treason. He died in England in 1658, at the age of seventy-two.

His son Richard, Jr., the grandfather of Gurdon, was born in Yorkshire, England, in 1610. He entered the University of Cambridge in 1627, at the age of seventeen. As he came to Massachusetts with his father in 1630, he evidently did not complete the full course of four years at the University. He settled in Ipswich, Mass., where he resided till 1672, when he returned to England, where he died April 29, 1694.

His son Nathaniel, the father of Gurdon, a council-

lor of some note, was born at Ipswich, Mass., in 1639. He was graduated from Harvard College in 1659. He settled in Haverhill, Mass., where he died May 21, 1707.

His son, Gurdon Saltonstall, was born at Haverhill, March 27, 1666. He appears to have entered Harvard College at the age of fourteen. For he graduated in 1684, at the age of eighteen. He studied theology rather than the law, which was the profession of his father. Probably he pursued his theological course under the tutelage of some clergymen, since there were no schools of the prophets. He had the best of blood in his veins. By birth he was an aristocrat. He got his name, Gurdon, from his grandmother, who was Muriel Gurdon. Lucy Downing wrote from Watertown, Mass., to John Winthrop, Jr., June 22, 1683, as follows: "Last night Mr. Gurden came to me to desire my house for his lodging, and his daughter is to be married next week to Sir Richard Saltonstall's son." This young pastor of the First Church of Christ gave promise of a distinguished career, which, as we shall see, was amply fulfilled.

As introducing the story of this pastorate, two or three facts may be noticed. The question of securing the minister's salary was a perplexing one. It had been raised by assessing the "minister's rates"

upon the grand list. This had become so odious that an attempt was made about this time to secure it by voluntary subscription. A paper was circulated. One hundred and five subscriptions were obtained, embracing names scattered over the whole township, "from Nahantic Bay to Mystic, and from Poquetannuck to the Sound." Only £57 were pledged. The sum was entirely insufficient, and the plan was abandoned.

The Bradstreet meeting house had not been furnished with seats as late as 1690. In that year a levy was made for the purpose of completing the interior of the building. A committee, consisting of the townsmen, or selectmen, with Eusign Clement Miner, and Sergeant Thomas Beeby, was then appointed to assign seats. This was sometimes an affair of no small magnitude. In doubtful cases of precedence it was often necessary for the town to interfere and decide between two contending parties. At this time but one case was reported for adjustment. The vote stands as follows: "Joseph Beckwith having paid 40s. towards finishing the meeting house, is allowed a seat in the 4th seat, and his wife also in the 4th seat, on the woman's side." Similar votes at later periods show that this supervision of the town continued for a considerable time. The vote was always mandatory; sometimes peremptory. With a law

making attendance upon the services of the Church obligatory, and with the town to say how much a man should pay and where he should sit, there ought to have been little solicitude about an audience, no anxiety lest men should quarrel over the possession of a given pew, and no fears about the finances of the Church. However, it does not seem to have been any smoother sailing then than now.

The entrance of Mr. Saltonstall upon his duties as pastor of the Church was signalized by the purchase of a large brass bell, for which the sum of £25 current money was paid. This was the first bell in the town, and in New London county. It took the place of the drum, which had hitherto called the people together for public worship and town meeting. William Chapman was the sexton. To his annual salary of £3, forty shillings were added as compensation for ringing the bell.

When Mr. Saltonstall came to New London the colonies were full of alarm, because of the ambitious attempts of Sir Edmund Andros to deprive them of their liberties. The career on which the young pastor entered at his ordination was not a thornless one. From the day when he was made the minister of the Church, till the day when he died as Governor of the Colony, he encountered difficulties and oppositions which were calculated to try the stuff of which he

was made. How well he stood the test, the story of his life will tell.

Upon coming to New London, assisted by a gratuity voted him by the town, he bought a lot, and built a house for himself on Main street, nearly opposite the bridge leading across the cove to East New London. Like himself his dwelling was conspicuous, at least for situation. The meeting house in the town square was not far back of his dwelling. His lot was bounded in the rear by the Codner highway, or "old pathway leading from the meeting-house to the mill." This had been closed, but was reopened by the town for his convenience. This reopened pathway is now known as "Stony Hill." A gate, opening into it from his grounds, brought him within a few rods of the church. A chronicler of those times relates that he might be seen, on a Sunday morning, issuing from this garden gate, in the rear of his house, and ascending the steep declivity, with slow and majestic step, to the meeting house, with his wife by his side, while his three sons and four daughters, followed by the household servants, brought up the rear. The procession was specially imposing after he became Governor of the Colony.

After his death, his son, General Gurdon Saltonstall, continued his father's procession to the house

of God on the hill; only his retinue of sons and daughters was fourteen.

The Church received no accessions between the death of Mr. Bradstreet and the ordination of Mr. Saltonstall. In the interval of eight years the membership decreased from about seventy to thirty-three. During his ministry one hundred and forty-one were admitted into the Church, whose names are given on the list. This is not a large number—less than ten a year. But when we consider the facts the number gains in significance. The population of those days was sparse, and there were fewer people from whom to recruit the ranks of the Church. The Half-way Covenant, with its disastrous effects upon the spiritual life of the Church, was in full practice. The Rogerene movement had gained full force. The era of modern revivals had not yet dawned. Not until half a century later did a great awakening visit the Churches of New England. In view of all the facts we must regard the number of accessions as far from small.

At the date of his ordination Mr. Saltonstall made this entry on the records of the Church: “Nov. 25, 1691. Names of members in full communion.” He then gives the following list of persons who composed the Church on the day when he became its pastor:

Captain Jas. Avery and wife.	Mrs. Mannering.
Captain Witherell.	Mrs. Ann Latimer.
William Douglass and wife.	Widow Leister.
John Stebbins.	Neh. Smith's wife.
Ensign C. Miner.	Sarah Tyrrell.
David Caulkins.	Mrs. Dennis.
David Leister and wife.	Joseph Becket's wife.
Dea. Joseph Coite and wife.	Widow Hempstead.
Robert Douglass and wife.	Lydia Bayley.
Captain James Avery.	Mrs. Starr.
Thomas Avery and wife.	Joseph Morgan's wife.
Goodwife Comstock,	Mary Sherwood.
Goodwife Dart.	Goodwife Geeres.
Mrs. Elizabeth Harris.	G. Saltonstall.

Thus the total membership at the opening of his pastorate was, including himself, thirty-four—twelve males and twenty-two females. Then follow the one hundred and forty-one names of those who were added between November 25, 1691, and August 3, 1707, when the last admissions during his ministry were recorded.

But there are entries among the records of baptism which seem to show that several other names should be put upon the list. For example, "February 4, 1694, Mr. Truman's daughters, they both professing faith in Christ," were baptized Mary and Ann. These were probably the daughters of Joseph Truman, who came to New London in 1667. February 18 of the same year it is recorded that "Mr. Ashby's 2 daughters made a profession of faith, owned the covenant and were baptized; the one Mary, the

other Hannah." These were the daughters of Mr. Anthony Ashby. Miss Caulkins says that "his two daughters, Mary and Hannah, united with the church in 1694." The record of their baptism is the only one which tells that they were received into the Church. There are some reasons for believing that it was so meant. If they were received into the Church, so were the daughters of Mr. Truman, of whom the same record was made. To profess faith in Christ, and at the same time to be baptized, is now equivalent to joining the Church on the part of one who was not baptized in infancy.

There are several entries like the following: "Samuel Rogers, son of Joseph, owned the covenant, and was baptized Samuel." But these differ from the foregoing, in that the person is not said to have professed faith in Christ. It was Mr. Saltonstall's custom to baptize adults who did not at the time make public profession of faith and join the Church. Mr. Samuel Rogers joined the Church April 9, 1699, four years after his baptism.

May 26, 1695, this entry was made: "Bro. David's Indian Jane made profession of the Christian faith, and taking hold of the covenant was baptized Jane." "April 23, 1699, John Young made profession of the Christian faith owned the covenant & was baptized." "December 22, 1700, John

Christophers made a confession of the faith owned the covenant and was baptized John ; his wife owned the covenant also ; they had at the same time their daughter baptized Elizabeth.” He is recorded as having joined the Church about a year later, November 15, 1701. June 29, 1701, “ George Way owned the covenant and was baptized himself and admitted to the Lord’s Table, and also had his children baptized.” He is recorded as having been received into the Church a little later. But in his case, and that of Mr. Christophers the confession of faith ended in complete Church membership. There may have been reasons for the delay which would fully explain it. “ James Rogers, sou of James, made profession of the Christian faith, owned himself under the bond of the covenant of grace, and thereupon was baptized.” “ December 28, 1701, Mary Covel professed publicly the faith, owned the covenant, and was baptized.” “ February 1, 1702, Elleph Chappell made profession of faith and reperntance and was baptized.” “ March 8, 1702 Ellenor Jennings made profession of the Christian faith and was baptized.” “ June 7, 1702 Rice’s child” was baptized “ his wife being in full communion with the church.” Her name does not appear on our printed list ; but this must be an oversight, as the above entry points to her membership in it. “ October 25, 1702, Hannah Bahr and

Mercy Manwaring made profession of faith and were baptized." "August 27, 1704 Mary, a mulatto, living at Jonas Green's, professed faith in Christ, owned the covenant and was baptized." "June 2, 1706, Thomas Willee made profession of faith, owned the covenant, and was baptized." These cases differ from the usual formula of the Half-way Covenant, in the statement that the candidate made public profession of faith in Christ.

Mrs. Rice was a member in full communion say the records. Mr. George Way and Mr. John Christophers were also. If their making profession of faith in Christ ultimately meant Church membership, there would seem to be good reason for saying that a similar entry pointed to the same Church relations in the case of Mary and Ann Truman, of Mary and Hannah Ashby, of brother David's Indian Jane, of John Young, of Mary Covel, of Elleph Chappell, of Elleanor Jennings, of Hannah Bahr, of Mercy Manwarring, of Mary the mulatto who lived at Jonas Green's, and of Thomas Willee, of each of whom it is recorded that they made profession of the Christian faith, owned the covenant and were baptized. It is true that the practices of the times were somewhat loose, and too much stress is not to be laid on entries like these just quoted. Nevertheless, such

records now would signify that the person was received into the Church. Therefore we believe that these fourteen names should be added to the list of those whom Mr. Saltonstall received into full communion, after November 25, 1691, making the whole number 154.

Several records of baptism are worth noticing, as showing the custom of the times. They point unmistakably to the practice of the Half-way Covenant. "December 29, 1691, Mr. Richard Christophers owned the covenant, and had his children baptized." He did not become a member in full communion till March 12, 1693. "October 4, 1692, the son of Adam Pickett, named John," was baptized, "and committed to the care of his grandfather, Daniel Wetherell." "February 4, 1694, Sampson Horton's children" were baptized "on the right of his wife." She was not a member here, but may have been elsewhere. There are nearly one hundred entries, made by Mr. Saltonstall, which say that certain persons who were not in full communion, owned the covenant, and had their children baptized or were baptized themselves. April 12, 1696, a man from Norwich, whose name is not given, had a child baptized Mary, "his wife being a child of the church here, and owning the covenant." A number of entries are made in which men had children baptized on the

wife's account who, as is sometimes stated, was in full communion. The following entry is also suggestive of a practice of those times. September 29, 1706, "John Stedman's children being presented by their grandmother John Fox's wife," who joined the Church in 1691. The following records, September 20, 1702, present still another phase of the baptismal question, and show how earnestly it was coveted for the children. "The wife of Mr. Ray being Mr. Manwaring's daughter and baptized here owned the covenant and had her three children baptized." "The wife of Mr. Wilson being Mr. Manwaring's daughter, and baptized here owned the covenant and had her child baptized." These are clear cases of the practice of the Half-way Covenant, and show that the baptized children of the Church were considered as within its pale, and entitled to some of its privileges. Men who were under censure were allowed to have their children baptized in the right of their wives. Thus May 26, 1700, James Avery, Jr.'s, child "in right of his wife, he being under offence." Persons who were guilty of gross sins were not allowed to present themselves or their children for baptism under the Half-way Covenant even, until they had made public acknowledgement of their sin and professed repentance therefor. Thus it is recorded that Esther Swaddles, who was not a mem-

ber of the Church at any time, "having before given satisfaction to the Church for her sin of fornication, owned the covenant and was baptized."

Mr. Saltonstall's record of baptisms includes over five hundred and seventy names. Most of them are those of children; some are those of adult persons who under the usages of the times were admitted to the rite of baptism without entering into full covenant relations with the Church. The record of baptisms begins December 6, 1691, "Daniel Leister's child Thomas," and ends December 1, 1707 "Richard Codner's child Elizabeth, George Way's child, Mehitable."

He was the first to perform the marriage ceremony in New London as a clergyman. He recorded thirty-seven instances in which he officiated on such occasions. The list is introduced as follows: "A record of Marriages commenciug March 31, 1697 containing the Persons who were married by me Gurdon Saltonstall." The first record is, "March 31, 1697 Ichabod Sayre son of Francis Sayre of Southampton on Nassau Island was married to Mary Hubbart of New London in Connecticut." The last record is "December 1707 Thomas Beeby and Anna Hobson both of New London."

In 1694 an event of a serious nature took place. July 11 a vote was taken by the town to proceed

forthwith to build a new meeting house, " and that a rate of twelve pence on the pound be made for it. Capt. Wetherell, Mr. Pygan, Capt. James Morgan, Lt. James Avery, Mr. John Davie, Serg^t Nehemiah Smith, Ensign John Hough, and Richard Christopher" were "chosen a committee to agree with the workmen for building the house, and managing the whole concern about it." This is all the record we have to tell us that a new house of worship was needed. But there is incidental evidence, that the Bradstreet meeting house, which had been completed four years before, was destroyed by fire, probably in June of that year. There was a suspicion, though without evidence to support it, that it was an act of incendiarism committed by the Rogerenes. Several of them were arrested and tried ; but the crime could not be proved against them. Without doubt they were innocent. For they were so obnoxious to the community, that a failure to find evidence to convict them was *prima facie* proof that they were not guilty.

The proper committees were appointed, and the work of replacing the lost edifice was pushed with commendable energy. It appears from the Colonial Records of the session of the General Court for October, 1694, that the Colonial Legislature voted the town assistance in replacing their lost house of worship. The record stands, the General Court " by

their vote granted to New London the sume of sixty pownds towards the charge of the rebuilding of their Meeting House, to be payd out of their country rate.'' In four years the third or Saltonstall meeting house was so far completed as to be used for public worship. It occupied the same commanding site where its two predecessors had stood. It was the last house to be built on that spot, and was used for divine service till 1785—a period of eighty-seven years—when it was replaced by the fourth, or Channing meeting house, which was the first to be built on the present location.

To this third house of worship Governor Fitz-John Winthrop gave a bell. July 18, 1698, the town voted to accept the gift "with great thankfulness," and desired "that their thanks may be given to his Honor for the same." At the same meeting it was "voted that the bell be forthwith hanged and placed on the top of the meeting house at charge of the town, the townsmen to procure it to be done." It was also voted that the edifice should be finished that summer; and it was done, and seats were assigned. Privilege, however, was given to certain persons to build their own pews, but under such restrictions as to "place and bigness" as the town might impose. They were to pay no less in rates for completing the house. A sexton was chosen at the same meeting, his duties were defined, and his salary was fixed. William

Halsey was the man on whom the honor fell. His duties were "to sweep and cleane the meeting house every weeke and to open the dores upon all publique meetings and to ring the bell upon the Sabbath day and all other publique days of meeting and allso to ring the bell every night at nine of the clock winter and summer, for which service the towne hath voated to give him five pounds in money and ten shillings yearly." With the change of ringing the curfew at eight o'clock instead of nine on Saturday nights, this custom which was then established has been continued to the present, a period of two hundred years.

Thus the meeting house was completed, and the simple arrangements for the worship of God were made, which amply met the requirements of that day. Put by the side of the more costly and pretentious piles of the present, those early temples would doubtless seem insignificant. If the plain service of the fathers were contrasted with the more elaborate rituals of today, they would, perhaps, seem tame. But if the glory of the temple depends upon the divine presence, and if the acceptable nature of the worship depends upon the sincere spirit, and fervent devotions of the worshippers, who can say that the more magnificent structures and the more elaborate service of the present can surpass the less pretentious ones of two centuries ago?

The previous chapter made it very evident that a man of Mr. Saltonstall's regard for order would certainly come into collision with people like the Rogerenes. The incident given, in which John Rogers rushed into the Church while Mr. Saltonstall was holding service, and disturbed it with vehement denunciations of the minister and the worship, illustrates the trials with which he met at their hands. Soon after his long confinement in Hartford, which he brought on himself by this disturbance of divine service, John Rogers provoked a personal conflict with Mr. Saltonstall by circulating "a lying, false, and scandalous report against him, the said Gurdon Saltonstall, and did publish the same in the hearing of diverse persons." Mr. Saltonstall prosecuted him. The case was tried at the session of the county court held in New London, September 20, 1698. The verdict brought in found "for the plaintiff six hundred pounds and costs of court £1 10s."

As the previous chapter has shown, the Rogerenes defied the Colonial laws relating to marriage. A sequel to the story of the union of John Rogers and Mary Ransford is told, which illustrates the collision which often took place between them and Mr. Saltonstall, in which he was pretty likely to get the best of the controversy. The Rogerene nuptials took place in 1700. Sometime after, Mr. Saltonstall met

them together and, assuming an air of incredulity and surprise, asked, "John, do you really and truly take this your servant maid for your wife? Do you, Mary, take this man, so much your senior for your husband?" Both gave an affirmative answer. "Then," said Mr. Saltonstall, "I pronounce you, according to the laws of this Colony, man and wife." Mr. Saltonstall had the right to perform the ceremony, and so in spite of themselves they were married according to the requirements of the statutes which it was part of their creed to despise and ignore. Rogers, seeing himself outwitted, shook his head and replied, "Ah, Gurdon, thou art a cunning creature." Something like this may have taken place. The story serves to illustrate the defiance of the civil order by these people, when it came in conflict with their views. And it shows how they must have been a disturbing element in the parish, and a ceaseless annoyance to Mr. Saltonstall, who insisted on obedience to the established order, whether civil, or ecclesiastical.

The famous Liveen legacy came into the hands of the town during the ministry of Mr. Saltonstall. It was given by the terms of the will, "to the ministry in New London," Mrs. Liveen to have the use of one-third of it during her life. This seems to have been the first gift for the purpose of supporting the

gospel which this Church received. Mr. Liveen was an Englishman by birth. He married Alice Hallam who was the widow of a trader in Barbadoes. She had an estate of about £200 which, with the business of her former husband, came into the hands of Mr. Liveen. At Mr. Liveen's death, October 19, 1689, his will was executed, and his estate came into the hands of the town for the purposes specified.

The will was a peculiar one for two reasons. One was that the two sons of the man who laid the foundation for the fortune, and accumulated a considerable portion of it, Nicholas and John Hallam, received nothing from their father's estate. The will was contested. The case was carried up through the courts to the throne, where the decisions of the lower courts were confirmed, and the town was established in the possession of the property under the provisions of the will.

Another reason why the will was peculiar was that Mr. Liveen was an Anabaptist; that is, one who held that it was necessary for those who had been baptized in infancy to be rebaptized. During his residence in New London he was never known to attend any religious meeting in town. His business often took him to Boston. While there he went to hear Mr. Milbourne at the Anabaptist Church. These occasions were his only attendance on religious services in

America from the time of his coming to New London in 1676 till he died.

The executors of this peculiar will were General Fitz-John Winthrop and Edward Palmes. The property made over to the town "consisted of two dwelling houses, a large lot attached to one of the houses, now forming the north side of Richards street and extending from the old burying ground to the cove ; and in money £300 sterling, equal to 780 ounces of silver, which was left in the hands of the executor." Mr. Palmes withdrew and Mr. Winthrop was the sole executor. After the expenses of defending the will were paid, the sale of the lands belonging to the estate, together with the Liveen money at interest aggregated about £1900, the income from which was nearly sufficient for the salary of the minister for many years. The fund remained long after 1738, but from one cause or another it has melted away till not a farthing of it remains, and that legacy, which was so large a factor in the support of the gospel during Mr. Saltonstall's pastorate, and later, now exists only as a fact of history. Whether its disappearance was due to bad investments or to the mismanagement of the executors, or to a worse cause, nothing appears to determine.

During the ministry of Mr. Saltonstall in the year 1699, two solid silver communion cups were presented

to the Church by Christophers and Picket, the owners of the ship Adventure. These cups are still in use.

The vigorous nature of Mr. Saltonstall's administration as a magistrate, was not altogether absent from his methods of Church discipline. He was an advocate of strict ecclesiastical order, and was as insistent in asserting his authority as custodian of the affairs of the Church, as in requiring obedience to his decisions as a civil magistrate. The strong features of the Saybrook Platform, which became a part of the ecclesiastical law of the Colony early in his administration, are his finger marks on it. He was disposed to deal in a severe and summary way with all who dissented from the established order. The pastor of those times was clothed with quite as much authority, both civil and ecclesiastical, as the pastor of to-day. Mr. Saltonstall was a magistrate as well as pastor. Among the people he had the reputation of being imperious; perhaps not altogether without reason. His hand was sometimes heavy upon offenders, though often less so than was represented. He was careful to maintain the discipline of the Church, and offenders against its purity, its order, and its rules, were called to account. The following, taken from the records of the Church, will serve to illustrate this phase of Mr. Saltonstall's administration of its affairs. Samuel Fox, who joined the Church under

Mr. Bradstreet, was "excommunicated for pertinacious contempt of the holy covenant and ordinances," August 6, 1699. This was the only case of excommunication recorded. But several were suspended from Church privileges because they were under offence. Thus May 26, 1700, James Avery, Jr., a member of this Church, had his child baptized "in right of his wife, he being under offence." June 5, 1701, Robert Allen's children were baptized "in right of his wife, he being under offence in signing a paper containing several false and scandalous things and not manifesting repentance." He also was a member of the Church. Edward Avery was also under censure for a like offence; for the records preserve the fact of his reconciliation. There are many examples which show that the Church, under the "Parish way," exercised a watchful supervision over the life and conduct of those who were not in full communion, as well as those who were. For the rite of baptism was repeatedly refused to the children of those who had been living disorderly until they had acknowledged their sin, professed repentance, and given satisfaction to the Church. Such records show that Mr. Saltonstall had very decided views as to Church discipline, and that he was not remiss in the discharge of his duty. It is not unlikely that his faithful and prompt administration won enemies for

him among his parishioners, and helped to produce the popular impression that he was severe and imperious. For people did not like any better then than now to be called to account for misdemeanors.

He is described as tall, well proportioned, and of dignified bearing, which did not invite familiarity. Doubtless this added to the impression that he was rigorous in the exercise of authority. But among his brethren in the ministry he enjoyed unbounded popularity. Like Paul, he magnified his office. He loved synods, and was inclined to the more rigorous forms of ecclesiastical government. In his theological views he was strictly orthodox.

Probably as a result of his rigorous administration of discipline a number of the leading members of his Church on the east side of the river became dissatisfied with his ministry. A list of "Complaints against the Elder of the Church of Christ in new London" was drawn up in 1700, and signed by five members.

These complaints were presented to the General Court, May 9 of that year, and by that body were referred to an ecclesiastical council. The council met at Killingworth, considered them and reported the result to the Church. The following minute was entered upon the records: "June 12, 1700, a council was convened consisting of the churches at Saybrook, Lyme, Killingworth, Stonington, Norwich,

Preston, and Messengers from the same chnrches; upon occasion of a paper of complaints against the Elder of the Church of Christ in New London and others, signed by 5 members of said church viz. Lieut. James Avery, John Morgan, Sam^l. Bill, John Fox and John Morgan Jr. and presented to and published in the last general assembly sitting at Hartford May 9, 1700 by James Avery, John Morgan and Edward Palmes. The said council was convened at the motion of said church in New London for their advice as to what was the said church's duty in reference to said subscribing Brethren and others of the subscribers who were under the watch of said church. The result of said Reverend Councill thereupon was given in June 19, 1700, signed by said Elders and Messengers, the originall under their hands being preserved in this book, and was communicated to the Brethren of the First Church of Christ New London June 19, 1700 at a church meeting then appointed and convened." "The original under their hands" has been lost, and was never entered upon the minutes of the Church. We are not informed as to the details of the findings of the council. But we know that, by its advice, the offenders were censured and suspended from the privileges of the Church, which, as we have seen, was done in the case of James Avery, Jr., and others.

This, however, did not end the matter. For a paper of remonstrance against this action was drawn up and signed by several, who were also suspended from Church privileges, till they should acknowledge their offence. Thus June 22, 1701, it is recorded that a certain John, whose last name does not appear, "having given satisfaction to the Church for his offence in signing the remonstrance, owned the covenant and had child baptized."

What the complaints were, which were made against Mr. Saltonstall, we are not told, nor has any copy of them been preserved. But we may suppose that they related to the rigorous measures of discipline which he took with those who at all dissented from the established order, or called in question his methods and authority. Most of those who were under censure for this offence were afterwards reconciled to Mr. Saltonstall and restored to fellowship.

Not long after the settlement of these difficulties a Congregational Church was gathered at Groton—the second child of this Church. As early as 1687 it was ordered that, for the convenience of those residing on the east side of the river, "they should have liberty to invite the minister of the town to preach on their side of the river every third Sabbath during the four most inclement months of the year." About the year 1700 the inhabitants in that part of the

town began to move for a separate organization. The arrangement was finally effected amicably by vote of the town, February 20, 1704-5. In 1702 it was voted that the people on that side of the river should be permitted to organize a Church, to have a minister of their own, to pay him a salary of £70 a year, and to build a meeting house thirty-five feet square. This was to be done at the joint expense of the people on both sides of the river. A Church was organized, and Rev. Ephraim Woodbridge was ordained as its first minister, November 8, 1704. A second society was organized in Groton in 1724, and is now the Church in Ledyard. Its first preacher was Samuel Seabury, who soon became an Episcopalian, went to Europe for ordination, and returned to minister to St. James Church, in New London.

During the ministry of Mr. Saltonstall the principles of the regular Baptists were planted in Groton. Valentine Wightman was ordained in Rhode Island. He came to Groton in 1705, was the first Baptist minister in Connecticut, and planted within its borders the first Church of that denomination. He was active in planting other Churches of this name throughout the Colony, and in the city and state of New York. The Church which he founded in Groton is now the Baptist Church in Old Mystic. Its first house of worship was built on Fort Hill, and, it is

said, was called the Pepper Box. Mr. Wightman was a scholarly man. He died in Groton, June 9, 1747.

Mr. Saltonstall was a masterful preacher. It is said that his appearance in the pulpit was wonderfully imposing and majestic; the audience seemed enchain'd to his lips, and the eloquence of his eye was said to be no less impressive than that of his tongue. His fame spread rapidly, and it was considered a great privilege to spend a Sabbath in New London and hear Mr. Saltonstall preach. The story is told that on some public occasion, like a conference, he preached six hours without a break, save that he paused long enough between two heads of his sermon for the people to eat their lunch, and with such power that he held his audience to the close. That he could find enough to say worth saying to fill up six hours, and keep people together to hear him to the end, sufficiently testifies to his ability as a preacher. The days had not yet dawned in which the sermon that lasts more than thirty minutes is a weariness to the flesh of the hearers. An article appeared in the *Boston News Letter* after his death which spoke of the "concise fulness of his diction and style," the charm of his voice, the clearness and strength of his reasoning, and the fitness and grace of his gestures, which made him heard "with satisfaction, delight and rapture." He was a scholarly man, as is shown

by the fact that he was able to pronounce an elegant oration in Latin upon the occasion of the final removal of Yale College from Saybrook to New Haven. He was one of the great men of those times which begat great men for great emergencies. The Church had a wide and commanding influence under his ministry. In 1697 the honor of preaching the election sermon was conferred on him.

Extracts from a sermon which he preached here December 19, 1702, will give an example of his methods of thought, and style of public discourse. The text was Luke xix, 17: "And sent his servants at supper-time to say to them that were bidden, come for all things are now ready."

"These words declare what means God makes use of to bring sinners to a partaking in the way which is provided for us in the Lord Jesus Christ which is: The ministry of His Gospell The ministers of which are compared to a servant sent by the master of the feast to the guests that were bidden to come and eat of the entertainment provided for them. In which words we may observe :

1. The originall of His Gospell ministry which is divine. * * *
2. The persons employed in it are described—
 1. Royal Authority and Power ye have received from the Lord. * * *
 2. In the relation which ye sustain by virtue of their office were you stiled his servants. It is in a peculiar manner the Lord's work that ye are employed in. It is in his name that ye speak. * * *
 3. The persons to whom they were sent; those that were bidden; viz., such as were under Gospell offers of mercy, or

such as God in his infinite mercy had made choice of to take. * * *

4. The work or service which they were employed about; with reference unto these; viz., to persuade them to a due acceptation of that infinite mercy which was offered, to urge that invitation saying come.

5. The speciall season wherein they were sent on this errand, supper-time, that very opportunity when what was offered might be sought and had.

6. The way and manner wherein they were to perform this service; viz., by using the most persuasive argument with them. "For all things are *now* ready." * * *. If you be wise for yourselves, you will hearken to this voice.

Doct. (Generall.) God's great end in giving the ministry of the Gospell to men is to bring them to accept of * * * mercy. * * * Now God doth not merely provide and tender these things, which he doth wherever the news of the Gospell comes, but he doth moreover urge your acceptance of them. * * *

The subjects here spoken of unto whom the Lord sends his servants were such as were bidden to the Gospell feast. They were not ignorant what mercy God had prepared for sinners in Christ. The news of it had been brought to them, and they had been invited. * * * He doth not leave them thus, but sends his servants to these men, renews the invitation, and persuades them not to reject it, but to come as they were called; and receive what was made ready for them. Now this part of the ministeriall work which * * * in a due endeavor to win men's souls to a cordiall closing with the Gospell offers is what Christ sets before us in the words, and declares to be a principall end and use of that office in the church.

1 Conc. God did from all eternity purpose the salvation of (some) of fallen men. There is nothing in time but what was in the counsell of God before time. God foresaw man's fall before man himself had a being. And * * * he did in infinite wisdom and Goodness order and overule it to the advancement of his own Glory; and did in his allwise Counsel resolve to improve it as an occasion for the illustration of his

mercy in and through Christ. * * * There was in the divine heart an eternal purpose of mercy towards miserable fallen man; and a decree of heaven that tho the enemy of human society should * * * bring destruction upon the whole race of men, yet he should never triumph in that so full destruction but that some of them should be recovered out of his hands and become the eternal trophies of divine mercy.

2 Conc. There was therefore provision made for the accomplishing of this end. * * * I think that what God * * * intended was to glorifie his mercy and the salvation of sinners through Jesus Christ, and in order to that, permitted the fall, and so gave his son to redeem. * * * Man's fall would indeed render him a subject properly capable of mercy, but withal it would render him unworthy. * * * The justice of God would interpose and challenge the guilty. * * * Therefore God did provide an Atonement for us.

3. And hence it follows that this mercy shall most certainly be applied; for nothing would be more unworthy of God than to suppose that, though he had prepared and made provision for it, *that yet nothing shall come of it.* * * * God hath purposed to show mercy unto men; provided mercy for us in Christ; offers that mercy to men in the Gospell, and then leaves the matter wholly to us whether we will choose or refuse, and hence it follows that it depends on the will of man whether the purpose of God shall take effect or no. * * * We know the promises of the Lord shall stand. Psalm xxxiii, 11. * * * That the efficacy of the divine purpose doth not depend upon reluctant wills of sinners, but the mercy which he hath purposed to bestow upon man shall take effect, and we shall be saved.

4. Whereupon it became necessary that this mercy should be offered to men and accepted by them, for this purpose of God was in no ways destructive of, or repugnant to human nature, or that method of Government which God in his infinite wisdom did exercise over them. * * * God would deal with him (man) as with a reasonable creature in bringing him to (him). * * * God, when he made man at first * * * prescribed a law to him with threatenings and promises, and placed him under its government. * * * When man fell

* * * he remained a reasonable creature still * * * and therefore the same generall method of government over him was as proper as at first. * * * The mercy he intends for men (or for any) must be offered, and they be brought to partake of it in a rational way i. e. by their own acceptance.

* * *

5. This acceptation was, as to man, wholly impossible, for it was not only above his power, but contrary to his disposition. The fall brought a dreadful curse on all mankind. It did not only expose him to divine wrath in the world to come, but did wholly disable him from, yea render him the mortall enemy to the service and will of God. * * *

And how can it be imagined that fallen man, so blind as not to know what makes for his own happiness, and so much an enemy to his own good as not to regard what he is told about it, should ever of his own accord fall in with the Gospell offers of mercy? Especially consider tis so contrary to our pride,

* * * but to put the matter out of all doubt, the word fully declares the acceptance impossible by our own strength. Rom. viii, 7: "Because the carnal mind is enmity against the law of God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be."

6. There was therefore a necessity that means should be used with those whom God will save that they may be brought to accept the mercy tendered them. I speak of an hypothetical necessity, considering what God had purposed; for if none had been used, but all mankind left to the inclination of their own wills it is no hard matter to resolve what the enmity of their own hearts would put upon them; and if, as the case now is, when God affords us so many means, and so great assistance, the righteous can scarcely be saved, then certainly we may conclude that if there was nothing done to breathe life into dry bones, even the elect should perish. Wherefore God having determined to show mercy to them, and that it should be offered so that they should accept it, it became requisite that if unwilling they should be made willing, it was promised, "thy people shall be made willing in the day of thy power." * * *

The operation of the spirit is not a blind impulse upon the

hearts of men. * * * But as God hath made men free and rational agents, so when he doth by his spirit incline their hearts to close with the Gospell offers, he doth it in a rational way, and brings them to see that it is highly reasonable that he should do so. Wherefore not only the spirit acts in you but you act also and willingly yield yourself to the Gospell call.

7. The ministry of God's word is a fit and proper means for this. * * * It is peculiarly adapted to this end, viz. to persuade men to accept this offered mercy. * * *

8. Hence, lastly, it follows that this is one great end in giving a Gospell ministry to men. * * * In the text the servant was sent to such as were hidden. * * * He is sent * * * not to inform them * * * but to persuade them to accept the invitation to come, and therefor he uses an argument to press the matter upon them without delay, for all things are ready."

This, it must be said, is strong meat. Men and women accustomed to listen to such preaching were little likely to be weak. The doctrines emphasized leave no room to doubt that the author was a Calvinist.

The years of revivals had not yet come. But such stalwart preaching prepared the ground, and maintained the Church upon that firm evangelical basis, which his predecessors in office had established, and from which it has never been moved.

The pastorate of Mr. Saltonstall covered a period when stringent Sabbath laws were in force. They were promptly executed. Their enforcement may seem to us severe, but it was in keeping with the spirit of the times. No law was treated as a dead

letter. It expressed the prevailing public sentiment.

Several entries upon the records of the Church and of the town, show that the morals of those times were not always spotless. There were breaches of virtuous living, violations of the law of social purity, riotous disturbances of the peace, quite as flagrant as any which occur now. Nevertheless those who were at the front were great men and women. Leaders in the beginnings of any people are made great by the necessities which called them forth. Strong hands and quick eyes must lay the foundation blocks. Men in colossal periods are of necessity strong; just as men lifting great weights must have brawny muscles lying along their thighs and arms and chests. Go into a furnace where men handle great masses of iron. See how their sinews are swollen with strength. Go into the workshop of the ages where Titans are forging great destinies, or casting great constitutions. Power and might are graven on every face, because these men are handling mighty problems, and establishing great principles. The men who have to do with the beginnings of the Church, of the State, are compelled to be great. The men who laid here the foundations of civil and religious liberty were great men. Among them all, as by far the ablest man of his day in Connecticut, must be placed Gurdon Saltonstall—states-

man, scholar, preacher, and Christian gentleman of the courtly type of the olden days. He was a conspicuous figure in the civil and religious history of Connecticut, and of New London, for thirty-seven years. He was a man of indomitable will, and was made of the same heroic stuff as the old Scotch Covenanters. He was a born statesman, and ended his life as chief magistrate of the Colony of which his great grandfather was one of the original patentees. He left the pastorate for the office of Governor January 1, 1708. Nearly twenty years had elapsed since he came to New London to assume charge of the Church. Sixteen of these years he had been its regularly ordained pastor. We now turn to the gubernatorial office to trace his further career.

XI.

GURDON SALTONSTALL, GOVERNOR.

January, 1708.—September, 1724.

To leave the pastorate for the civil office of Governor was a step so unusual as to cause remark. Nor were the remarks always favorable. Thus Backus, in his Ecclesiastical History of those times, said, in an ill-natured vein: “Governor Winthrop died there (in Boston) November 27, 1707, upon which a special meeting of their General Court was called to choose a new Governor. By a law then in force, he was to be chosen out of a certain number of men in previous nomination; but they broke over this law, and elected an ordained minister for their Governor; and he readily quitted the solemn charge of souls for worldly promotion, and was sworn into his new office January 1, 1708, after they had repealed the law which they had broken.” It was so unprecedented that the pastor of a Church should be summoned to leave his sacred calling, to attend to affairs of State, that the Assembly, by whom he was chosen, sent a committee of eight, including three

deputies and the speaker of the House, to wait upon him in New London, and urge his acceptance of the office. This committee were charged with a letter addressed to the town, by the Assembly, "using arguments to induce them to acquiesce in the result." As a further persuasion a gratuity of £100 was given to New London, "as a compensation in part for depriving the town of its former minister, Mr. Saltonstall," and to enable them to settle another pastor. The vote as recorded in the Colonial Records reads, "this Assembly upon the motion and desire of the inhabitants of New London and the arguments by them insisted upon, do grant to the said inhabitants £100 in pay out of the next countrie rate, towards the settling of a minister there." This vote was passed at the May session of 1708, when Governor Saltonstall took his seat after his first election by the people to be the fifth Governor of the State. Considering the man, and the price for ministers now-a-days, the State got the best end of the bargain. The fact that the Assembly repealed the law which stood in the way of his election, so that he might be elected by the people, and the fact that he was re-elected every year till his death, September 20, 1724, prove that the Colony thought so too. There could not be stronger testimony to his conspicuous gifts of administrative ability, to his justice as a magistrate, and to

his sagacity as a statesman, than his repeated re-election by his fellow citizens.

There is no record of town or Church relating to this event. It is likely that some were quite willing to have him go. Such a man as he would be sure to make enemies. He was too strong and positive in his convictions not to encounter opposition. But the loss to the Church and to the town was great, when such a leader and pastor was taken from them. The action of the Assembly shows that opposition was expected. Probably it was encountered. There is some evidence that the loss was felt.

It is doubtful whether any other instance can be found in which the pastor of a church left the pulpit for the chair of state. But the early New England parson was a conspicuous factor in civil life. While he rarely took the reins of government into his own hands, yet his advice was always sought on important occasions; and that advice was often the basis of political action. Thus it was said of John Cotton "that whatever he delivered in the pulpit was soon put into an order of court, if of a civil, or set up as a practice in church, if of an ecclesiastical concernment." As early as 1634 Rev. Mr. Cotton preached to the deputies and officers who were to conduct the affairs of state. For the early thought of government was a theocracy, and the Bible was the chief

political manual. So the minister, who knew most of the word of God, was resorted to for wisdom and guidance. From this preaching to the deputies by John Cotton came the practice of preaching election sermons.

It is well known that Thomas Hooker was the first to enunciate the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence, that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, when he said that "the foundation of authority is laid in the consent of the people," that "the choice of magistrates belongs unto the people by God's own allowance," and that "they who have power to appoint officers and magistrates, have the right also to set the bounds and limitations of the power and place unto which they call them." These principles of a free State were the beginnings of constitutional government in the world, and they issued, says Mr. John Fiske, in the "first written constitution known to history that created a government, and it marked the beginnings of American Democracy, of which Thomas Hooker more than any other man deserves to be called the father."

It was Nathaniel Ward, the minister of the Church in Ipswich, Mass., that prepared The Body of Liberties, which was the earliest written code of that

Colony, and was adopted by the General Court in 1641. These facts go to show how naturally the parson of those early times appeared in politics, and help to explain how Mr. Saltonstall took so unusual a step as to leave the pulpit for the chair of state.

Some other facts shed further light upon this action. Mr. Saltonstall inherited a judicial mind, and the gift of statesmanship. It was said of him after his death that "he had a great compass of learning, was a profound divine, a great judge in the law, and a consummate statesman." So that the General Assembly acted wisely when they removed the legal restriction which made him ineligible to the office of Governor. From the first of his pastorate he was associated with the leading men of the Colony. He was interested in public affairs. In 1693 he was invited by the General Assembly to accompany Fitz-John Winthrop, who was sent to England, as the Colony's agent, "to obtain in the best way and manner he shall be able, a confirmation of our charter privileges." It does not appear that Mr. Saltonstall went. But the fact of his appointment shows how prominent he was in civil affairs, while he was yet pastor of the church.

During this period he was several times called upon to perform civil offices for the Colony. Thus in 1698

the last Wednesday of February was appointed as a day of public thanksgiving to God for “the restoration of peace to the English Nation, and the success & safe return of our agent; and the Rev. Mr. [Timothy] Woodbridge and Mr. Saltonstall are desired to draw a bill for that end.” In 1700 he was one of a committee appointed by the General Assembly “for composing the differences in Haddum.” At another time he was appointed on a committee to wait upon the Earl of Belmont on his arrival in New York, “in the name of the Governor, Council and Representatives of this Colony, to congratulate the happy arrival of his excellency.” The election sermon which he was chosen to preach May 13, 1697, seems to have been a production of considerable power, as copies of it, by the direction of the legislature, were “divided to the several counties, proportionably according to the lists of the several counties.” These incidents, not common to the life and experience of a pastor, show how naturally he was drawn into active participation in public affairs. The Hon. Fitz-John Winthrop was his friend and parishioner. His relations with Mr. Winthrop brought Mr. Saltonstall into immediate knowledge of Colonial matters.

After Mr. Winthrop was made Governor in 1698, he often called upon his pastor for advice and assistance. Palfrey says that during the last of his

administration Winthrop was so disabled by gout that most of his official correspondence was conducted by his friend and pastor, Gurdon Saltonstall. The editor of the Winthrop Papers says: "It is true that his health had long been a good deal impaired, and for this reason he more than once desired to be relieved of the governorship, but the people of Connecticut were unwilling that he should retire. It is also true that he had grown to place much reliance on the wisdom and capacity of Saltonstall, who was not only his intimate friend and neighbor, but pastor of the church in which he worshipped."

When Governor Winthrop went to Boston, November 13, 1707, to attend the second marriage of his brother, Wait Still Winthrop, as was his custom he left his affairs in the hands of Mr. Saltonstall, as Governor *pro tem.* While in Boston Mr. Winthrop was seized with a fatal illness and died November 27. The deputy, Robert Treat, was advanced in years. Mr. Saltonstall was acting Governor. Therefore when the General Assembly was summoned to New Haven to choose a successor to Mr. Winthrop, December 17, 1707, their thoughts naturally turned to the man who was already exercising the functions of that office, and whose experience in public affairs, as the friend and adviser of their late Governor, fitted him to hold the place as the choice of his peers.

But the law of the Colony required, as Backus pointed out, "that the governor should always be chosen out of a list of magistrates nominated at the preceding election." Mr. Saltonstall was not in nomination, and was not eligible. Therefore at a special session, January 1, 1708, this law was repealed, and Mr. Saltonstall was chosen by the deputies to act as Governor till an election could be had by the people; which took place in May 1708, when he was made Governor by the will of the free-men of the Colony. Thus by natural fitness, and by natural steps, he came to be the chief magistrate of Connecticut.

His official life was marked by two conspicuous events, which were destined to exert a lasting and beneficent influence upon the religious and intellectual life of the Colony. One, and not the least memorable, was the famous Synod of Saybrook, called by order of the Governor and General Assembly, and which produced that venerable document, the Saybrook Platform, which, it is said, he had a hand in shaping. Proposals for a scheme of government by "a classical power above the churches" had been defeated. On the thirteenth of May, 1708, the General Assembly of the Colony, on account of "defects of the discipline of the churches of this government arising from the want of a more explicit asserting of

the rules given for that end in the holy scriptures," and for the "glory of Christ our head," ordered that the ministers of the several Churches should meet "at Saybrooke, at the next commencement to be held there," to prepare a "form of ecclesiastical discipline" to "be offered to this court at their next session at New Haven October next, to be considered and confirmed by them." In obedience to this command the Saybrook Synod met at that place, which was then the home of Yale College, September 9, 1708, and produced the venerable document already referred to. It was submitted to the General Assembly, as ordered, and the following vote was passed, October 1708: "This Assembly, do declare their great approbation of such a happy agreement, and do ordain that all the churches within this government that are or shall be united in doctrine, worship and discipline, be, and for the future shall be owned and acknowledged established by law; provided, always, that nothing herein shall be intended or construed to hinder or prevent any church or society that is or shall be allowed by the laws of this government, who soberly differ or dissent from the united churches hereby established, from exercising worship and discipline in their own way, according to their consciences." This sounds very much like an established Church, only in this case the State Churches

were Congregational. The vote was in accord with the spirit of the Governor and of the times. A Church in some way under the protection and patronage of the State was thought to be essential. Ecclesiastical questions, and questions of doctrine and discipline were taken to the legislature as to a sort of standing ecclesiastical body or court. The provision made for dissent, however, saved the action of the legislature from being compulsory, and opened the way for Churches which declined to come within this establishment.

This Church was among the number which availed themselves of this privilege of dissent. Dr. Field says that Mr. Saltonstall's "great influence was not sufficient to induce the church to adopt the Saybrook Platform of discipline."

The second conspicuous event, destined to exert a wide influence on the intellectual life of the Colony, and of the whole land, was the final removal of Yale College to its permanent home at New Haven. This was not brought about without a controversy. Of course Saybrook wanted to keep it. If it was to be moved, other places claimed it. John Winthrop, son of Wait Still Winthrop, wrote to his father October 24, 1717: "there is great disturbance in the Colony about the college. The last year Mr. Stonington Noyes was violent for keeping it at Saybrooke, or else-

they should lose the old Governor's [Yale's] legacy to it, but since his son is settled in Mr. Pierpont's place and house, he has without leave or order from the Assembly or trustees moved it to New Haven, and ordered a building to be erected for the purpose, which is almost finished." Mr. Pierpont, referred to above, was one of the original trustees of the college, and pastor of the First Church in New Haven. That Mr. Winthrop's son was wrong appears from the fact that at a meeting of the trustees held at Saybrook, April 4, 1716, it was practically decided to remove the college from that town. On the 12th of September commencement was held there, and the trustees adjourned to meet at New Haven on the 17th of October, which may be regarded as the date of its establishment in its present home. At that meeting they voted that "considering the difficulties of continuing the collegiate school at Saybrooke, and that New Haven is a convenient place for it, for which the most liberal donations are given, the trustees agree to remove the said school from Saybrooke to New Haven, and it is now settled at New Haven accordingly." This vote, which was passed October 17, 1716, was declared legal by the upper house at the October session of 1717. The commencement of that year was held at New Haven in September. The prompt action of the upper

house, confirming the action of the trustees the year before (1716) was due, in part at least, to the influence of Governor Saltonstall, who favored the establishment of the college at New Haven. The vote at the October session (1717) which advised the trustees "to proceed in that affair, and to finish the house which they have built at New Haven for the entertainment of the scholars belonging to the collegiate school," prevailed by thirty-six votes. This vote was modified by a vote to distribute one hundred pounds among the instructors of the college, in the three competing places, Wethersfield, Saybrook and New Haven, "according to the proportion of scholars under their tuition." At the commencement September 12, 1718, held at New Haven, the college was named after its most generous donor, Mr. Elihu Yale. His excellency, the Honorable Gurdon Saltonstall, was present, and "was pleased to crown the public exercises with an elegant Latin oration, in which he expatiated upon the happy state of the college, as fixed at New Haven, and endowed with so many benefactions. He particularly celebrated the generosity of Governor Yale, with peculiar respect and honor." Thus Governor Saltonstall's administration was identified with an educational movement of far reaching importance. He had a

hand in laying the foundations of one of the foremost universities not only of this, but of all lands.

Various important events of a political nature also contributed to make the period of his official life conspicuous. Those were days of narrow resources for the Colony; so much so that often its agent in London found it difficult to collect his salary. There was need of money to raise troops for an armed descent upon Nova Scotia; to repel threatened attacks of the Indians; to guard the coast from assaults by French ships; and for various other purposes. The Colony had to borrow money, and issued bills of credit, amounting in all to £33,500; all of which were finally called in, and the debts of the Colony paid.

Disputes with adjoining Colonies concerning boundary lines also came up for settlement and furnished perplexing questions for his administration to consider. The controversy with Massachusetts, which often became a quarrel between the border towns as to the ownership of property, was finally adjusted. "Upon the 13th of July, 1713, commissioners fully empowered from each of the Colonies, came to an agreement which was adopted by each court." The decision gave 107,793 acres to this Colony as an equivalent for the encroachment of Massachusetts upon its territory. Trumbull says, "the whole was sold in sixteen shares in 1716, for the sum of £683

New England currency. The money was applied to the use of the college."

The lines between Connecticut and New York on the west and Rhode Island on the east were not settled till after Governor Saltonstall's death. In the final adjustment this Colony lost considerable territory which belonged to it under the original charter. Trumbull says, "no colony perhaps had ever a better right to lands comprised in its original patent than Connecticut, yet none has been more unfortunate with respect to the loss of territory." Long Island, Fisher's Island, and others along the coast, were included in the original grant of Charles I to Robert, Earl of Warwick, and by him ceded to Sir Richard Saltonstall and ten others March 19, 1631. Out of deference to the Duke of York the Assembly gave up this and other territory to New York; for Charles II had "granted a great part of the lands contained within its (Connecticut's) original limits," to him; and the Assembly did not dare oppose this disposition of its territory "for fear of offending those royal personages and losing their charter." Trumbull says further, "considering the enemies and difficulties with which they had to combat, it is admirable that they retained so much territory, and so nobly defended their just rights and liberties." In all these transactions during his administration, the hand of Gov-

ernor Saltonstall was seen, as a vote of the Assembly declares. For at the October session of 1720 this body resolved "that proper acknowledgements, be made to the honorable Governor for his great pains, industry, wisdom and prudence improved in that affair concerning the line between this Colony and Rhode Island."

Another perplexing dispute which the Colony was forced into by Joseph Dudley, the sworn enemy of Connecticut, was the adjustment of claims made to lands by Owaneco and the Mohegans. The case, in 1705, went against the Colony. But it was reopened, upon petition of Connecticut, and the former decision was reversed, "by King George III in Council." It was further decided that the Indians had been dealt with fairly and justly, and with "much humanity."

Various attempts were made to compel Connecticut to surrender her charter. One, already referred to, was the demand in the King's name, made upon Governor Treat by Sir Edmund Andros. The charter, which mysteriously disappeared during the discussion concerning this demand was concealed by Captain Joseph Wadsworth in the hollow of an oak, which became known as the Charter Oak. At the May session of the Colonial Legislature, 1715, it was voted, "upon consideration of the faithful and good service of Captain Joseph Wadsworth, of Hartford,

especially in securing the duplicate charter in a very troublesome season when our constitution was struck at, and in safely keeping and preserving the same ever since unto this day, this Assembly do, as a token of their grateful resentment of such, his faithful and good service, grant him out of the Colony treasury the sum of twenty shillings." This bill became law, and therefore must have received the signature of Governor Saltonstall.

Another effort was made before Parliament, October 27, 1712, to vacate the charter. Connecticut's rights were successfully defended by Sir Henry Ashurst, its agent in London. The Colony was in so sore financial straits that the council were constrained to accept the offer of the Governor to give the Colony credit in England upon his own account. Else the charter would not have been defended. These attempts to merge this Colony in some other, and to take away its charter, show the stubborn, and withal successful, fight for autonomous existence which Connecticut was making during the administration of Governor Saltonstall. At the October session, in 1718, the Assembly voted "that the secretary draw out a copy of the charter of this government and transmit the same, as soon as he can, to the printer, who is ordered to imprint the same, and take off at least two hundred copies thereof for the use of the

inhabitants of this Colony." At the session of May, 1720, it was voted to pay Timothy Green, of New London, £4. 3s. 8d. for printing the charter. This charter which was so sturdily defended, and which the administration of Governor Saltonstall handed down to posterity in a printed form, continued in force, as the fundamental law of the State till 1818, and was the basis of the present constitution.

The times were stirring and tumultuous when Gurdon Saltonstall assumed the chair of office. It was during the French and Indian war. There was a running fight with the Indians, breaking out sometimes into such open violence as the Pequot war in the last half of the 17th century. The colonists were kept in a state of continual unrest. French vessels frequently appeared in the Sound and threatened the coast. At one time at least New London was fired upon. Two or three times between 1690 and 1713 Connecticut was called upon to furnish troops for expeditions against Canada, which formed a marked feature of the Colonial history of New England. On one occasion this Colony furnished 350 men. In May, 1709, Governor Saltonstall wrote to Sir Henry Ashurst that the Queen's (Anne) order had been received, to join Massachusetts with 400 men, and proceed against Canada, and that these men had been raised according to Her Majesty's instructions. These

enterprises were of frequent occurrence, and consumed the resources of the country without compensation. During the year 1711 French vessels kept the people in a state of constant apprehension. During the same year French ambassadors visited Governor Saltonstall at his home in New London; for what purpose does not appear. In 1712 he carried out the suggestion which he had made to Fitz-John Winthrop in 1690, and erected a beacon on the west end of Fisher's Island, and placed a guard there to prevent surprise by the French privateers which infested the coast, and did considerable damage to the shipping of New London, and threatened New York.

The following is a copy of the Governor's proclamation, signed by his own hand, during the Queen Anne's and Indian war. It is interesting as showing the inducements offered to volunteers in those days:

By the Honourable Gurdon Saltonstall, Esqr., Gouernour and Commander in Chief of Her Majestie's Colony of Connecticut in New England.

A PROCLAMATION.

Whereas, The General Assembly of this Colony have granted 300 men, to Serue in the Expedition Her Majestie hath appointed for the Reduction of Port Royal and Nova Scotia, under the Comand of the Hon^{ble} Col^o Francis Nicholson, as General of all the forces in the said Expedition, and the Hon^{ble} William Whiting, Esq., as Colonell of the Regiment to be Raised in this Colony for the said Service—

For the incouragement of able body'd Persons to inlist

themselves Voluntiers in the Same, I do hereby, by & with the advice of the Councill and at the desire and with the Consent of the Representatives in General Court assembled, assure all such persons who shal voluntarily inlist themselves for the said Service with the Captain or other Chief Officer of the Respective Companies to which they belong, or the Major of the County in which they reside, that they shall each of them have a Coat of the Vallue of thirty Shillings, a fire lock of the value of forty Shillings, three years freedom fromm all Impresses to serve out of this Colony, & one months pay in hand before they go out of the Colony, go under our own officers & return home as soon as Port Royal and Nova Scotia are reduced, or the Expedicon otherwise determined. Given under my hand in Newhaven the 9th day of August, in the 9th year of her Majestie's Reigne, Anno Dom. 1710.

G. SALTONSTALL.

God save the Queen.

Thus for the first five years of his administration Governor Saltonstall was as truly a war Governor as was Governor Buckingham during the War of the Rebellion. Taxes were high, rating at twenty-seven or twenty-eight pence a pound. October 8, 1713, there were only thirty-eight taxable towns in the Colony, and forty sent delegates. Forty-five towns were under the exclusive jurisdiction of Connecticut. The grand list of the Colony was £281,083. Its militia amounted to about 4,000 effective men. Its population was about 17,000. [Trumbull, vol. i, p. 476.] The tax of war upou so small a population of slender means must have been heavy. It therefore must have been a day of rejoicing when, August

22, 1713, the Governor and Council were able to proclaim to the Colony the peace of Utrecht, which had been signed by the plenipotentiaries of England and France March 30 of that year.

There were good reasons why Governor Saltonstall did not find the gubernatorial chair an easy one. The oppositions of jealousy, which a strong man is almost certain to awaken, added to the difficulties he had to encounter. One Mr. Witherell writes of "evil minded persons," who were doing their best to hinder the prosperity of the Colony. This opposition was such that he seriously contemplated refusing to continue in the office. For a letter from Sir Henry Ashurst, written June 27, 1709, says, "I pray let no discouragements suffer you to entertain a thought of leaving the government God hath called you to. By what I have heard, there are none to supply your room." At the May session of 1715, the General Assembly passed a vote which shows that the enemies of this great and good man were still awake and active. The vote, as recorded in the Colonial Records, is as follows, "This Assembly, having made enquiry after, and considered the representation which the honorable Governor made of some slanderous report, very grievous, supposed to be industriously scattered among the people by some ill minded and seditious persons, cannot understand

the least ground for auy such reports—do therefore desire the judges and justices would take utmost care for the suppressing of such ill practice; and do further signify their earnest desire that his honor would continue the service of God and his country in the office whereunto he is elected.” This was complete and triumphant vindication of his honor, his purity, his integrity. But the most triumphant vindication against every slander was the fact of his yearly re-election by his fellow citizens from 1708 till he died in 1724. And it is to be remembered that, while Governors were appointed for other Colonies by the Crown, Connecticut from the first elected hers from among her own citizens.

For sixteen and a half years Mr. Saltonstall was Governor by the will of the people. He was elected seveteen times to the office. He was present at thirty-six sessions of the General Court, and at two hundred and thirty-seven meetings of the Governor and Council, which were held at Hartford, New Haven, Saybrook and New London. He was appointed commander-in-chief of the Colony’s forces; was appointed in 1709 to represent the Colony in England; was made judge of the superior court by vote of the General Assembly; assisted at the request of the same body in the revision of the laws of the State. In short, he discharged the duties of his high

office in most critical times, with the most signal ability, insomuch that his rare executive qualities were recognized abroad as well as at home. He was easily the first man of his times in Connecticut, and the encomiums pronounced upon him after his death cease to seem extravagant when the facts of his life are studied. He was Governor in times which demanded a strong hand and an unflinching will at the head of affairs. His yearly re-election to office, till death took him away, shows that in the view of his peers, he was the man for the times. He was born to rule. There was the ring of command in his voice, and an aspect of authority in his mien. It must have been an imposing sight to see His Excellency, when invested with the authority of the State, proceeding at the head of his household to the house of God, to engage in devout worship. It does not require a very vivid imagination to hear the tramp of battalions in his majestic step, and to see the movement of armies in his dignified bearing. He was by far the ablest Governor which Connecticut had had, and easily commanded the place of honor. A careful review of his life must impress one with the justice and probity with which he discharged all public trusts committed to him.

Before we close this review of his public life, a few facts concerning him may be added, illustrative of

his strong personality, and pointing out his relations to the town and to private life.

By an act of the Colonial Legislature, May 13, 1703, an addition was made to the bounds of New London, and the Governor was made one of its patentees. There was a tract known as the junior commons, embracing the land lying along Bank street, and between it and the water. These commons became a source of contention. One party maintained that they belonged equally to the whole body of voters, and that they had power to dispose of them in town meeting. Another party, led by the Governor, contended that these lands were solely the property of the patentees. A town meeting was called April 23, 1722, to consider what disposition the voters wished to make of them. The Governor wrote a vigorous letter on that date, addressed "To the inhabitants of New London, assembled in Town Meeting April 23, 1722, Friends and Neighbors." In it he gave the town to understand that these undivided lands did not "still remain in the town's hands to dispose of as town meeting shall cause." He supported his statements by quoting the act of the General Assembly declaring "that those lands which had not been before settled and disposed of did belong to s^d proprietors of them," of which he was one. He closed his communication with the hope that the town

would consider his protest "and not be tempted further into any such discords." However, lest the voters should disregard his warning, he added I "do therefore hereby as one of the said Patentees and Proprietors of s^d Patent, as also in the name of all the proprietors afors^d, * * * declare and protest against those and all such votes, acts, and doings of or in any town-meeting, and the recording of them as illegal, and contrary to s^d resolve and just rights of s^d proprietors." The town had no difficulty in understanding what His Excellency meant to say. His warning and protest had the desired effect, and proved the strength of his influence among his fellow townsmen.

The Governor was a considerable land holder, not only in New London, but elsewhere. He inherited from Sir Richard Saltonstall a tract of about two thousand acres at Warehouse Point in the town of Windsor. Through his second wife, Elizabeth Roswell, he came into possession of the "Furnace Farms" in Branford with certain other property. He also possessed a manor at Killingly in Yorkshire, England. This, with the Roswell estate he bequeathed to his son Roswell, who lived in the town of Branford. His will reads, "as it is the appointment of law, so it is also my will that my children," "Roswell, Nathaniel, Gurdon, and Katherine should have

all the real estate which I had by their mother deceased, and that my eldest son Roswell shall have a double portion thereof. * * * To my son Roswell, as his double portion of the said 'maternal estate, the farm in Branford,' by the Iron Works." This was the "Furnace Farms" mentioned above. Roswell settled in Branford, upon this estate, and lived on it till he died in 1738. The will is a long document, and goes into details in the distribution of his property. The only other item pertinent to this history is the following: "I give to my son Gurdon and his heirs forever my house-lot with the dwelling-house thereon where I now live." This was the house which he built, and which was destroyed by Arnold when he burned New London.

An impression prevails in some quarters that Mr. Saltonstall, after becoming Governor of the Colony, took up his residence by Lake Saltonstall, near New Haven. Mr. Thomas Trowbridge, in a paper read before the New Haven Colony Historical Society, February 21, 1876, advocated this view. Referring to the property known as the Furnace Farms, into whose possession the Governor came through his second wife, Mr. Trowbridge says, "the proximity of the land to New Haven and Hartford, the two capitals of the Colony, the facility of access to both cities at once determined the Governor to make it his resi-

dence.” He refers to the mansion which, it is said, Mr. Saltonstall built by the lake, and which still stands. Mr. Trowbridge continues, “the Governor continued to reside alternately here and in New London till his death in 1724.” Doubtless he built the house in question. But that he made it his permanent residence, or resided alternately between Lake Saltonstall and New London, till his death, is true only in the sense that a resident of New York who spends his summers in New London, or in Newport, can be said to reside alternately between the two places. Mr. William Kingsley, in his history of Yale College, says that Mr. Saltonstall, soon after his choice as chief magistrate of the Colony, took “up his residence near New Haven in an elegant mansion which he built for himself on the banks of the beautiful lake which has since been known by his name.”

There is abundant evidence to show that this view is wrong; that Mr. Saltonstall never ceased to be a resident of New London, and that, with the exception of one summer, he stayed in New Haven only during the sessions of the Colonial Legislature. Let us examine the evidence. Robert Hallam, in his Annals, 1725 to 1875, says that Mr. Saltonstall, on being appointed Governor, “resigned his pastorate in New London, and filled prominent positions in civil life till his death in 1724, *retaining his residence in New*

London.” Mr. Hallam’s statement is borne out by certain facts upon the records of the town. April 27, 1714, Governor Saltonstall served a notice on the citizens of New London, in town meeting there assembled, warning them that none but the original patentees or grantees and their heirs and assigns could vote for the disposition of the public lands. A more extended communication upon the same subject was sent to the town July 4, 1715. Both these, as well as the letter referred to on a previous page [252] were written at New London. He addressed the citizens as “friends and neighbors,” and wrote as a local proprietor, and not as the resident of another town.

But a stronger evidence is to be found in the records of the meetings of the Governor and Council during all the years of his official life. Of 230 such sessions 156 were held in New London, 41 in Hartford, and 33 in New Haven. But none were held in New Haven till July, 1711, while in 1708 two were held in Hartford, and in 1710 nine were held in New London. A significant fact about these meetings is that, with a few exceptions, which will be noted, those held at Hartford and New Haven were held during the sessions of the Colonial Legislature, while immediately on the adjournment of the General Assembly the Governor and Council met at New

London through the remainder of the year save in a very few instances. Why were they held in New London so uniformly during the periods between the sittings of the legislature if the Governor's residence was near New Haven? For example, September 28, 1711, the Governor and Council met at New London to provide for the fall session of the Colonial Assembly at New Haven. October 15, 25, 26, while that body was sitting the Council met at New Haven. The Assembly adjourned October 26. October 30 there was a meeting of the Governor and Council at New London. Does not this point out that when his official duties connected with the session of the legislature were ended he returned to his residence, there to take up the routine of official duty? A special session of the legislature was held in June, 1711, in New London, called by the Governor and Council to consider the matter of filling the quota of the Colony in the expedition against Canada, and to provide bills of credit for fitting them out. This seems to point to New London as the Governor's residence.

The exceptions alluded to, in which the Governor and Council met at New Haven during months when the legislature was not in session, are, July and August, 1711, February 4, 1712, March 11, 1718, and September, 14 and 15, 1720. That is only fourteen sessions, out of the thirty-three held in New

Haven, were held during months when the General Assembly was not convened. He was unquestionably in New Haven during July and August, 1711. But no meetings of the Governor and Council, save those here noted, were held there, except when the legislature was in session. On the other hand from November 3, 1710, to August 31, 1724, a month before his death, the Governor and Council met every year, save 1718, at New London, and in the months when the legislature was not in session. This would seem to prove that Mr. Saltonstall continued to be a resident of New London.

A still stronger reason for this view is found in certain documents and deeds, in the records of New London, which show that Governor Saltonstall was certainly a resident of and a property holder in the town, during the following years, viz.: 1709, 1710, 1712, 1713, 1714, 1715, 1717, 1719, 1722, 1724. The missing years, save 1718, are supplied by the records of the meeting of the Governor and Council. So that we know that he was a resident of New London during his entire term of office. Thus there is an entry which reads as follows: "New London, July the first 1709 Matthew Jones, the above mentioned grantor appeared before me, Gurdon Saltonstall Esqr., Governor of her Majesties Colony of Connecticut." A similar record is dated September

25, 1709. May 10, 1710, a deed, signed by Owaneco, sachem of Mohegan, names as one of the grantees, "Gurdon Saltonstall of New London aforesaid." February 12, 1712, the Governor executed a deed which begins, "Know all men by these presents that I, Gurdon Saltonstall of New London" &c. Further, the Governor's will was dated at New London March 30, 1724, and begins: "I, Gurdon Saltonstall, of New London." And it will be remembered that in giving his house to his son Gurdon, he calls it "the house where I now live." Thus we have his own testimony to the fact that he continued to be a resident of the town after he became Governor of the Colony. It is significant that the only time when he can be located at New Haven, by Lake Saltonstall, for any considerable period, was the summer of 1711, less than a year after the death of his second wife. As his son Roswell settled upon this estate, it is not impossible that the lake got its name from him rather than from his distinguished father.

After his death his son, Gen. Gurdon Saltonstall, continued to reside in his father's house in New London, which, as we have seen was bequeathed to him by the Governor's will. F. G. Saltonstall of New York writes, "the destruction of General Gurdon Saltonstall's house, when Arnold burnt the Town, was the occasion of irreparable loss; pictures,

papers, all swept away.’’ This was the house which the Governor built for himself when he came to New London. It was never the property of the town, or parish.

Governor Saltonstall was thrice married. His first wife was Jerusha, daughter of James Richards of Hartford, who died in Boston, July 25, 1697. His second wife was Elizabeth, only child of William Rosewell of Branford, Conn. She died September 12, 1710. His third wife was Mary, daughter of William Whittingham, and widow of William Clarke of Boston. She survived him and died in Boston in 1729. He had five children by his first wife, two of whom died in infancy. Elizabeth was born May 11, 1690. She married first Richard Christophers, and second Isaac Ledyard. Mary was born February 15, 1691-2. She was baptized February 21. She married Jeremiah Miller. Sarah was born in 1694, and was baptized April 2 of that year. She married John Gardiner for her first husband, Samuel Davis for her second husband, and Thomas Davis for her third husband. Jerusha and Gurdon died in infancy. He had five children by his second wife. Roswell was born January 19, 1702, and was baptized January 25. He settled in Branford, his mother’s native town. His wife was Mary Haynes. He died Oct. 1, 1738. Katherine was born June 19, 1704. Mr. Saltonstall made

this entry of her baptism on the records of the Church. "June 25, my own daughter, who was born June 19 at two o'clock in the morning, Katherine." She married a Mr. Brattle. Nathaniel was born in 1706. The following is the record of his baptism: "July 7, my own son (born the Friday before) Nathaniel." He married Mrs. Lucretia Arnold, March 1, 1733. Gurdon was born December 22, 1708, and was baptized by Rev. Eliphalet Adams, February 20, 1709, and was the first child to which he administered the ordinance after becoming pastor of the Church. He married Rebecca Winthrop in 1733. Richard was born September 1, 1710 and lived but a few days.

Governor Saltonstall died suddenly at his home in New London, from a stroke of apoplexy, September 20, 1724, in the fifty-ninth year of his age, and in the full possession of all his rare powers. The blow was felt throughout the Colony. A vast concourse of people gathered at his funeral. The loss was mourned throughout New England, as well as Connecticut. He was buried with solemn religious ceremonies and imposing military honors, in a tomb which he had prepared, in that ancient cemetery, which deserves to be called New London's Burial Hill. He still sleeps in that historic spot where rests the dust of so many

of the men and women who had a hand in laying the foundations of this matchless harbor town.

The high estimate put upon his worth of character and rare ability, may be learned from what was said of him after his death. The *Boston News Letter* of October 1, 1724, said, “At twelve the next day he expired, to the almost unexampled sorrow of all that saw, or since have heard of it, not only through all that government, but the whole land.” Rev. Eliphalet Adams said in a discourse delivered at his funeral, “Who did not admire his consummate wisdom, profound learning, his dexterity in business, and indefatigable application, his intimate acquaintance with men and things, and his superior genius? And what was more than this, his unaffected piety and love to God’s house, his exact life and exemplary conversation? In what part of learning did he not excel? He had mastered every subject which he undertook, and nothing could escape his penetration. How great did he appear whether in court or camp! He was an oracle in law, and no man was better read, either in the agitated controversies, or abstruse points of divinity.”

Upon his death Dr. Cotton Mather, the famous Boston divine, preached a sermon October 1, 1724, “in commemoration of that good and great man, the Honorable Gurdon Saltonstall, Esq., late Governor

of Connecticut," which was "printed by T. Green, 1724," in New London. The text was Proverbs xi, 11, "By the blessing of the upright the city is exalted." Substituting the word "colony" for "city," he proceeds to set forth the doctrine that "A city, yea, every society that has men of a right character in it, will by the blessing of such men be remarkably blessed of God," and to apply it to Governor Saltonstall, in words like these, "Who are the men of rectitude (in our translation called the upright) whom every city or society they belong to, will always fare better for? A compendious, a comprehensive, and an unexceptionable answer might I at once give unto it, by only saying, 'Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright,' who was lately to be seen at the helm of the government of the colony of Connecticut." In a letter of condolence to Mrs. Saltonstall, he speaks of him as "one who had in him such uncommon collections of all that might render a person more precious than the golden wedge of Ophir." In closing his discourse Dr. Mather said, "We will not call him a star, but even a constellation of the most fulgid endowments." "And yet these were his lesser excellencies; unspotted piety, inviolate integrity, exemplary humanity, were what yet more potently bespoke for him a place among the excellent of the earth." Speaking of his assuming the gubernatorial office,

Dr. Mather said, he “ looked on the government cast upon him, to be but a betrustment for which he was accountable to the glorious one, who is the Lord of all.”

Much more might be quoted from the almost fulsome eulogies which were pronounced upon our fellow townsman of a former generation. After making due allowances, we have left the irresistible conviction that he was a great man.

He was one of a noble company of heroic men and women who helped to lay the foundations of the greatest nation of modern times. They made their age famous and colossal. One of the chief figures among his contemporaries, who was prominent in civil, social, educational and ecclesiastical affairs of this Colony, and of this city, for more than thirty-three years, was GURDON SALTONSTALL.

XII.

THE DIACONATE.

So far as can be ascertained the First Church of Christ has had forty deacons, including those now in office. We have, however, no positive knowledge of the existence of its diaconate previous to Mr. Bradstreet; only such as is to be gained from incidental sources. But these are sufficient to establish the fact, beyond a reasonable doubt, that there were deacons as early as 1655. Thus the diary of Thomas Miner says "Sabath day the 8 [of July, 1655] we had a sacrament." In the same year he speaks of "deacon perke." Who this was will appear.

It would not be like a Congregational Church to go on for thirty years without these New Testament officers. Whether the sacrament administered July 8, 1655, was the first we cannot tell. It may have been observed to signalize the entrance into the first meeting house which was completed early in that year. There must have been one or more deacons at that time. We give the list of those who we know have served this Church in that office.

1. THOMAS PARK is placed first on the list, though there may have been others before him. He was the son of Robert Park, and came to New London with his father early in 1650. His wife was a sister of Mrs. Blinman. They lived on the southwest corner of Granite and Hempstead streets, as we have already seen. Mr. Robert Park came with his family to New England from Preston, Lancashire, England, in 1630, in the ship *Arabella*. They landed at Boston, and probably settled in Roxbury. About 1635 they removed to Wethersfield. Their coming to Pequot was due largely, it may be presumed, to the fact that Mr. Blinman was to move here from Gloucester.

It would be most natural for Mr. Blinman's Church to choose his brother-in-law to serve in the office of deacon. Besides, there seems to have been the stuff that deacons are made of in the Park family. For Deacon William Park, of Roxbury, was his brother. We know that Thomas Park was chosen a deacon, from the diary of Thomas Miner. We have seen that he called him "deacon perke," under date of October 22, 1655. September 23, 1659, he wrote, "decon perke was at Misticke." Similar entries appear September 15, 1661, June 30, 1663, and later on. Who this "decon," or "deacon" Park or Perke was seems to be settled by this entry in

Mr. Miner's diary for April 9, 1672: "Tuesday the 9th I was with deacon parke * * * the 10th day deacon parke and we wer at quanquutoge. the 11th day mr. noyce and deacon prake and the company was heare. I agreed with mr. noyce and Tho. park." So that "decon perke" was Thomas Park. Hon. Richard A. Wheeler, one of Thomas Park's descendants, says, "Dea. Parke of whom Thomas Miner speaks in his Diary was Thomas Park who came with his father, Robert Park, from Wethersfield to New London in the early part of the year 1650." Mr. Wheeler also says "of what church Thomas Park was deacon I do not know unless it was your New London church. He was not, nor could he have been a deacon of the first Congregational church of Stonington, for our church was not organized until several years after he went to Preston to reside." This, then, was the only Church of which he could have been deacon in 1655, when Mr. Miner gives him that title. Then it does not seem out of place to say that he officiated at the Lord's Supper, July 8 of that year, of which Thomas Miner speaks. He must have been chosen prior to that date.

He lived a number of years at Mystic, within the bounds of Stonington. Some time before 1674 he removed to lands which belonged to him in the northern part of New London. In 1680 he was reck-

oned as an inhabitant of the latter place. Later he was included in Preston, and was the first deacon of Mr. Treat's Church, organized in that town in 1698. He died July 30, 1709. When he laid down his office here we do not know. But it may have been when he moved to his lands in the northern part of New London, before 1674.

2. JOHN SMITH came to New London from Boston early in 1653. His name appears in the list of members October 5, 1670. We know that he was a deacon of the Church, for in Mr. Bradstreet's diary is the following entry: "October 4, 1679; John Smith, one of the deacons of this church, a man of piety and use in the church and Town, went to heaven." As he came to New London in 1653, and as his name appears on the first list of members October 5, 1670, it seems probable that he joined the Church soon after his arrival, and that he was associated with Thomas Park, and officiated at that communion, July 8, 1655, of which Thomas Miner tells us.

3. WILLIAM DOUGLAS seems to have been born in Scotland in 1610. He came to Boston in 1640, and to New London in December 1659. He was also one of those who composed the Church at the time of Mr. Bradstreet's ordination. We know that he was a deacon, because under date of July 26, 1682, Mr. Bradstreet wrote in his diary, "Mr. William

Douglas, one of the deacons of this church died in the 72 year of his age. He was an able christian, and this poor church will much want him."

Of the date of his election we have no definite knowledge. In 1665 Mr. Douglas was sent to Boston to confer with "Mr. Wilson and Mr. Eliot" with reference to "the procureing of a minister for the towne." He may have been chosen to this duty because he was an officer in the Church. Further, Thomas Miner, in his diary, preserves a certificate of Christian character voted by this Church to himself and wife, June 30, 1669. It was signed on behalf of the Church by James Avery and William Douglas. It may be that their acting for the Church pointed to some official relation. There was no pastor at the time, and Mr. Avery may have acted as moderator. Mr. Douglas may have signed as a deacon. For these reasons the date of his choice to the office of deacon is placed before October 9, 1665, when he was chosen to go to Boston on the business of securing a pastor for the Church.

4. WILLIAM HOUGH came to New London from Gloucester about 1653. Thomas Miner writes in his diary, under date of July 27, 1670, "I and my wife was at new london goodman Rice and William Hough was received into the church." We know that he was a deacon because, August 10, 1683, in the last

entry which Mr. Bradstreet made in his diary, he says, "William Hough, a deacon of this Church, aged about 64, died. He was a solid man, and his death is a great loss to church and Town." He was elected deacon sometime after July 27, 1670. He may have succeeded Deacon Park.

5. JOSEPH COIT was the youngest son of John Coit, who came to New London from Gloucester, with Mr. Blinman, in 1650. He is the ancestor of all the Coits in Connecticut, and perhaps in the United States. He joined the Church April 3, 1681. His name is entered as Deacon Coit on Mr. Saltonstall's list of members, November 25, 1691, as already in that office. Then his election took place after 1681 and before 1691. The exact date cannot be found. Deacon Coit's second son Joseph was the first minister of Plainfield. Deacon Coit died March 27, 1704.

6. WILLIAM DOUGLAS, JR. The date of his choice is not known. His name appears on the Church records as deacon first in 1696, but so as to imply that he held the office before that date. He joined the Church in 1670, soon after the ordination of Mr. Bradstreet. His oldest son, William, removed to Plainfield, and was one of the first deacons of that Church, as Deacon Coit's son was its first minister. He was deacon of this Church for many years. His grave is in The Towne's Antientest Buriall Place,

and upon his stone is this inscription, "Here lyeth
y^e body of Deacon William Douglas, who died March
y^e 9, 1724, in ye 80 year of his Age."

7. CLEMENT MINER, son of Thomas Miner, was born in Hingham, Mass., in 1638. He came to New London with his father when eight or nine years of age, and continued to reside here till his death November 8, 1700. His grave is in the old burying ground, and is marked by a slab on which is the simple inscription, C. M., 1700.

He joined this Church April 30, 1671. We know that he was a deacon, because he usually appears on the town records either as Ensign Clement, or Deacon Clement Minor. The date of his election to this office is left wholly to conjecture. But as Deacon Hough died August 10, 1683, we may infer that he was chosen as his successor not long after. The pastor was the only Church clerk of those times, and as Mr. Bradstreet's death occurred soon after that of Deacon Hough, no record of Clement Miner's election to the diaconate was made.

8. JOHN PLUMBE was chosen probably in 1700. January 6, 1695, Mr. Saltonstall, in recording the baptism of Mr. Plumbe's daughter, Abigail, calls him John Plumbe, Jr. December 29, 1700 he makes this record of baptism, "Deacon Plumbe's child, Peter." His appointment to the office of deacon took place

therefore between January 6, 1695, and December 29, 1700. The exact date cannot be fixed. But the death of Deacon Miner November 8, 1700 offered a fitting occasion, and we may suppose that he was chosen not long after. He joined this Church October 15, 1693. He probably died sometime during 1732, the year in which his successor, Thomas Fosdyke, was chosen.

9. TIMOTHY GREEN joined this Church November 13, 1720. Mr. Adams made the following entry on the Church records on that date: "Timothy Green and his wife were recommended to our church from the North church in Boston." April 20, 1723, Mrs. Green was called "the deacon's wife" in a vote of the town assigning to her a seat in the Church, "on the woman's side." His election to the office of deacon, therefore, took place between these dates. Hempstead, in his diary, under date of May 4, 1757, writes, "deacon Timothy Green died this morning with diabetis * * * aged 78." His funeral was the next day. Miss Caulkins says that when Thomas Short, the first printer of the Colony, died in 1712, Timothy Green, of Cambridge, was invited by the Governor and company to take the place. He came about the year 1714. He proved a valuable accession to society. He was a benevolent and religious man, and an agreeable companion, having always at command a fund of native humor.

10. THOMAS FOSDYKE joined this Church October 6, 1717. Mr. Adams made this record: "Thomas Fosdyke was recommended to our communion from the old church in Boston." Another entry made by Mr. Adams reads, "At a church meeting December 11, 1732, Thomas Fosdyke was chosen Deacon in the Room of Deacon John Plombe deceased." He was a son of Captain Samuel Fosdick, who came "from Charlestown in the Bay" about 1680, and married Mercy Picket, of New London, November 1, 1682. Their third son, Thomas, was born August 20, 1696. He was, therefore, thirty-six years of age when he was chosen deacon. June 29, 1720, he married Esther Updike. To them was born April 3, 1725, Thomas Updike Fosdick, who figured somewhat in the scenes of the Revolution. Deacon Fosdyke married, for his second wife, Grace, daughter of Clement Miner, September 2, 1765. He died July 17, 1774, say the records of the town, aged seventy-eight. He must have gone to Boston in early life, where he joined the Church. For he was received into this Church by letter "from the old church" in that city, when he returned in 1717.

11. PYGAN ADAMS was the second son of Rev. Eliphalet Adams and Lydia Pygan. He was born March 27, 1712, and was baptized March 30. He joined the Church March 30, 1740. Rev. Mather

Byles entered the following upon the records of the Church : " May 5, 1758, the church met at the Meeting House after a Sacrament Lecture and Pygan Adams Esqr. was chosen by a very large majority to be deacon in room of Timothy Green deceased." May 5, 1758, Mr. Hempstead wrote in his diary, " At Lecture and then wee, the church, chose Capt. Pygan Adams a deacon ; twenty-five votes for him and Daniel Coit 1 ; 28 voters." October 22 of that year he wrote, " Mr. Byles preached in a new pulpit and Capt. Adams officiated for the first time as deacon." Deacon Adams died and was buried in our ancient cemetery. The epitaph on his stone reads " In memory of Pygan Adams, Esqr., who died July 1776, aged 64."

12. JOHN HEMPSTEAD and his wife Hannah, joined this Church June 21, 1741. He was a son of Mr. Joshua Hempstead, the author of the diary. His election to the office of deacon is thus recorded by Rev. Ephraim Woodbridge : " November 17, 1770, being y^e day of public thanksgiving, Mr. John Hempstead declared his acceptance of y^e deacon's office to which he was elected by y^v chh in September and was accordingly set apart to y^t work and office by prayer." The vote of the September previous, electing him to office was not recorded.

13. JOSEPH HARRIS was a son of Joseph Harris.

He was born December 1711, and baptized December 30. He joined this Church November 7, 1734, and was chosen deacon June 25, 1782.

14. WILLIAM DOUGLAS, the third deacon of the Church who bore that name, was also elected June 25, 1782. He was a son of Capt. Richard Douglas, and great grandson of the first Deacon William. He was born January 1, 1708, and was baptized February 1, by the Rev. John Woodward of the First Church in Norwich, this Church being at that time without a pastor. He joined this Church January 21, 1728. "He was constable in 1765, and a man of considerable importance in his day." [Douglas Genealogy, p. 84.] He died November 12, 1787, aged nearly eighty years. It is in place to say here that until the present, which breaks the honorable line of succession, there has been a Deacon William Douglas in every generation of the family from the first.

An entry on the Church records during the long interval between Mr. Woodbridge and Mr. Channing reads as follows: "At a meeting of the First Church of Christ in New London on June 25, 1782, on the occasion of choosing deacons in said Church, the Rev. Benj. Throop of Norwich being occasionally present was by the desire and unanimous vote of the Church appointed their moderator; when Joseph Harris Esq^r and Mr. William Douglas were chosen

Deacons by the major vote of said church, and accepted their office." At the time of their election these men were well advanced in life, Deacon Harris being over seventy-one and Deacon Douglas over seventy-four.

15. TIMOTHY GREEN was chosen April 17, 1788. He was a son of the former deacon of the same name. He first settled as a printer in Boston. But on the death of his brother, Samuel, he removed to New London, in 1752, and took charge of the business. He joined the Church January, 1788. He was one of those who came within this vote of the Church. "The following persons, who had been for many years in covenant [Half-way, probably,] with this church, but had not joined in the communion, having applied to the Pastor for admission to this privilege, were considered by the church as regular in their standing, and agreeably to their request were admitted to unite with us in full communion."

16. ROBERT MANWARING was elected to the same office, at the same time. He united with this Church August 12, 1787. The following entry on the records was made by Mr. Channing: "At a meeting of the Pastor and Brethren, April 17, 1788, the church being convened for the purpose of making choice of two Brethren to be the Deacons of this church, a prayer for the direction and blessing of the Great

Head of the Church being first offered ; the church proceeded to their choice. The votes being taken, it appeared that Brother Timothy Green, and Brother Robert Manwaring were chosen to be the Deacons of this church. Those brethren being present were desired to take this vote of the church into their serious consideration, and give their answer after due deliberation." On Thursday, the first day of May, "at the Lecture preparatory to the Lord's Supper, Brother Timothy Green and Brother Robert Manwaring were solemnly set apart by Prayer to the office of Deacons of this church, having previously declared their acceptance of the choice of the church."

Deacon Manwaring removed to Norwich. But he seems to have relinquished his office before 1799. There is no record of his resignation, but in a complaint brought against him by the pastor, Rev. Henry Channing, dated August 27, 1799, he is called, "one of the Brethren and late a Deacon in this church." The charge made against him was that he was the author of a writing, which had been affixed to a public sign post in the city, and which contained the following words, "Mr. Henry Channing, we agreed with you to preach Jesus Christ, not John Adams, in that most holy place, I mean the pulpit." Mr. Manwaring was acquitted of the charge by vote of the church, after a hearing of the case.

17. JOHN ARNOLD united with this Church by letter from the Church in Lebanon, October 6, 1793. He was chosen to the office of deacon November 13, 1794. The record of the action of the Church is as follows: "The church, considering the infirmities of the present Deacons, and that their duties are increased by the number added to the church, proceeded to the choice of two brethren to sustain the office of Deacons in this church in addition to those now in office;" that is, Deacons Green and Manwaring. As a result of the vote John Arnold was chosen as one of the two. "Thursday, May 26, 1795," the records tell us, "Brother John Arnold, having declared his acceptance of the office of a deacon to which he was chosen by this church, was, at the preparatory lecture this day, solemnly devoted to God in that office by prayer." He continued in the office till he removed from the city in 1803.

18. OLIVER CHAPMAN was the second deacon elected at the same time with John Arnold. But the records say that "Brother Oliver Chapman declined accepting the office." However, "at a meeting of the church, April 17, 1796, after a prayer for the divine direction and blessing, the church proceeded to the choice of a deacon. The votes being taken, it appeared that bro. Oliver Chapman was chosen." This time he accepted, and after the preparatory lec-

ture, May 19, 1796, he "was by Prayer solemnly separated and devoted to God in that office." He joined the Church June 20, 1790.

19. JEDEDIAH HUNTINGTON joined this Church by letter from the first Church in Norwich, November 9, 1794. The records preserve the following account of his election and induction into office: "At a meeting of the First Church in New London, after public worship on Sunday, January 20, 1799, the church being convened for the purpose of chosing one to sustain the office of a Deacon, after a prayer for the divine direction and blessing, the church proceeded to the choice. The votes being taken, it appeared that Bro. Jedediah Huntington was chosen. He being present, was desired to take the voice of the church into serious consideration, and after due deliberation give his answer." The final result is thus recorded: "Thursday, February 14, 1799, at the public Lecture this day, brother Jedediah Huntington was solemnly set apart by prayer to the office of Deacon to which he had been elected by the church."

Deacon Huntington's name appears frequently after this in various official relations. Thus he was delegate to sit, with the pastor, on the council which settled William Ellery Channing as pastor of the Federal Street Church, in Boston, June 1, 1803;

to sit on the council that installed Rev. Abishai Alden as pastor of the Church in Montville, August 17 of the same year; to sit on the council which settled his son, Rev. Daniel Huntington, as pastor of the Church in Bridgewater in 1812; and many other like occasions. He had a leading voice in the action of the Church when it called Mr. McEwen. He, with Deacon Guy Richards, was a committee to make known to Mr. McEwen the action of the Church. It is probable that he was chosen to take the place of Deacon Manwaring.

He was General Huntington of Revolutionary fame, and served through the war. After 1777 he held the rank of brigadier general. He was during part of the time an aid of General Washington, who always regarded him as a tried personal friend, and was a member of his military household. It was at General Washington's request that he was promoted to the rank which he held. He saw service in many of the important battles. He was with his companions in arms during the memorable winter at Valley Forge. He was a member of the court martial which tried Charles Lee for his insubordination at the battle of Monmouth, and he sat upon the court of inquiry to which was referred the case of Major André. On retiring from the war he resumed business in his native town, where he held several impor-

tant offices. In 1789 President Washington appointed him first collector of the port of New London, which position he held through four different administrations. His appointment to this office occasioned his removal to New London. In 1796 he built the house now owned by Mr. Elisha Palmer, modelling it somewhat after Mount Vernon, the home of the commander under whom he had served. He graduated from Harvard in 1763. The Master's degree was conferred on him by Yale in 1770. He made a public profession of religion at the age of twenty-three. He was an officer and pillar in this Church for twenty-six years. It is said that "his munificence, for its profusion, its uniformity, its long continuance, and for the discretion by which it was directed, was without an example or a parallel in his native State." He was the first president of Union Bank. He was the son of General Jabez Huntington, was born in Norwich, August 4, 1743, and died in New London, September 25, 1818, at the age of seventy-five.

20. GUY RICHARDS was the first deacon chosen by this Church in this century. The records say, "at a meeting of the First Church in New London, on Sunday, September 11, 1803, after prayer for the divine presence, direction and blessing, the Church proceeded to the election of one to sustain the office of one of the deacons vacated by the removal of

brother John Arnold from the city. The votes being taken, it appeared that brother Guy Richards was elected. He, being present, was desired to take the voice of the Church into serious consideration, and, after due time for deliberation, to give his answer." A further record reads, "Sunday, October 8th, 1803: This day after sermon in the forenoon, Brother Guy Richards was solemnly separated by prayer to the office of a Deacon to which he had been elected by the church." The date October 8th should be 9th, for the 8th that year fell on Saturday. Guy Richards joined this Church July 21, 1799.

At the first city meeting, March 8, 1784, Mr. Richards was chosen treasurer, and held office till he resigned in 1820, a period of thirty-six years. He was born in 1747, and died in 1825, aged seventy-eight. He was a son of Guy Richards, who was born in 1722, joined this Church in 1773, and died in 1782. It was the mother of Deacon Richards, Madame Elizabeth Richards, who gave one of the communion cups, now in use, in 1793, and who left a legacy of \$40 to the Church, which was afterwards used, by its vote passed Nov. 13, 1794, to change "Tankards belonging to the church into cups, as more convenient for the service of the table."

21. THADDEUS BROOKS was elected deacon Jan-

uary 4, 1817. He united with this Church, together with his wife, Abigail, November 25, 1787. On that same date, both he and his wife were baptized, together with four children, Hubbil, Abigail, Thaddeus and Elizabeth. Miss Caulkins says that he served for sixteen successive years in the common council of the city, together with Chester Kimball and John Way.

22. ELIAS PERKINS was also chosen deacon January 4, 1817. He united with this Church November 5, 1809. He graduated from Yale College in 1786, and was one of its *Socii* from 1818 to 1823. He was mayor of New London three years; 1829 to 1832. He was the first president of the New London Bank, which was incorporated in May, 1807. He was Member of Congress from 1801 to 1803. He filled many prominent positions in the town. He was born in Lisbon, April 5, 1767, but early in life became a resident of New London. In 1790 he was married to Lucretia Shaw Woodbridge, only daughter of Brother Ephraim Woodbridge, by the Rev. Henry Channing. He died September 27, 1845. Old subscription lists of money given to build the first house which stood on the present site, and to build the old Conference House, show that Deacon Perkins was a large and generous supporter of the Church.

23. STEPHEN PECK was also chosen deacon January 4, 1817. He was one of the first young men to join the Church under the fresh and evangelical impulses of Mr. McEwen's ministry; which he did April 22, 1810. Mrs. B. P. McEwen told the writer before her death, that his public profession of religion, at a time when young men held aloof from the Church, created a profound sensation. He built and occupied the house now owned by Dr. George Morgan. He removed from town before his death.

24. ISAAC CHAPEL was the fourth deacon chosen January 4, 1817. He joined this Church November 18, 1787. Dr. McEwen made the following record of the election of the last four deacons: "At a meeting of the church January 4, 1817, Thaddeus Brooks, Elias Perkins, Stephen Peck and Isaac Chapel were elected to the office of deacon."

25. WILLIAM P. CLEAVELAND was chosen to be a deacon of this Church May 24, 1830. The following minute of the action of the Church is entered upon its records: "At a meeting of the church May 20, 1830, voted that it is expedient to add to the number of those who now hold the office of deacon in this church. Adjourned to meet again on the 24 inst." "Met according to adjournment, May 24, 1830. Voted that it is expedient to add one to the present deacons of this church. Proceeded to a

choice, and elected William P. Cleaveland." Deacon Cleaveland joined this Church in 1824, and died January 3, 1844, aged seventy-four. He was a son of Colonel Aaron Cleaveland of Revolutionary fame, and was born at Canterbury, December 18, 1770. He graduated from Yale College in 1793. He settled in New London as a lawyer previous to 1800. He was an original member of the corporation of the New London Savings Bank.

26. EBENEZER LEARNED was chosen a deacon of this Church January 20, 1840. The following entry upon the records of the Church relate to his choice: "At a meeting of the church, January 20, 1840, voted that two deacons be chosen in this church additional to the two now in that office. A ballot was taken; and Mr. Ebenezer Learned was chosen third deacon of the Church. Mr. Learned declined the office to which he was chosen; and at his request the Church, by vote, excused him from holding the office." The matter was adjourned to another meeting. The records continue "At a meeting of the church February 6, 1840, for the purpose of filling up the vacancy, made by the declination of Mr. Ebenezer Learned, a ballot was taken; and Mr. Learned was reelected the third deacon of this church." The records state that he accepted upon this second election, and he was duly inducted into office.

Deacon Learned joined this Church in 1820. He was born in Killingly, March 27, 1780, but came to New London in early infancy. He graduated from Yale College in 1798. He was an original corporator of the New London Savings Bank. He died September 17, 1858, aged seventy-eight.

27. ASA OTIS was also elected January 20, 1840. After recording the election of Deacon Learned, the records say, "Another ballot was taken, and Mr. Asa Otis was chosen the fourth deacon of this Church." Mr. Otis accepted the office, and was installed in it.

Deacon Otis joined this Church in 1834. His name has been perpetuated by his princely gift of almost \$1,000,000 to the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. He lived at one time in Richmond, Va., where he accumulated his wealth. He came to New London before 1834, and died here March 10, 1879.

28. WILLIAM HOLDEN COGGSHALL was chosen to the office of deacon about 1854. Deacon Coggshall was born in Pawtucket, R. I., July 4, 1793. He came, in early life, to live in North Stonington. He seems to have joined the Church in that place, for when he removed to New London in the spring of 1826, he joined this Church by letter. His daughter writes, "all the communion service was kept at our

house, and as it was a large and valuable one, I remember that it was a great deal of care and responsibility, which impressed it upon my mind." He removed from New London to Brooklyn, N. Y., in the spring of 1860. He died in Belvidere, Ill., February 8, 1880.

29. ANDREW M. FRINK was probably elected deacon at the same time with Mr. Coggshall. He joined this Church in 1815. He was mayor of the city from 1843 to 1845, but he resigned before the expiration of his term of office. Deacon Frink died June 27, 1867, aged seventy-four.

30. JOHN W. TIBBITS was also elected, probably, in 1854. He joined this Church by letter in 1841. He removed from town before his death, which took place September 12, 1879.

31. CORTLAND STARR seems to have been elected to office at the same time with the three preceding. He joined this Church in 1831. He died April 11, 1865, aged fifty-seven.

There is no record of the choice of the last four deacons. But we know that they were chosen to the office prior to 1856. For at a meeting of the Church held Monday evening, January 28, 1856, for the purpose of renewing the call which had been extended to Rev. Thomas P. Field, but which he had declined, it was "voted that deacons William H. Coggshall,

Andrew M. Frink, John W. Tibbits and Courtland Starr be, and they are hereby appointed a committee to present to the Rev. Thomas P. Field a copy of the above vote," that is, the vote renewing the call.

32. WILLIAM H. STARR was elected to the office of deacon in 1865. October 23, 1867, he resigned his office, but the Church promptly refused to accept his resignation. He continued to serve till the close of 1882. He was born in Groton, May 27, 1808. In early life he went to Orange, N. J. In 1857 he removed to New London, and joined this Church by letter. He died April 27, 1884, aged seventy-six.

33. WILLIAM C. CRUMP was chosen the same year with Deacon W. H. Starr. He also resigned at the close of 1882. He died March 9, 1883, aged sixty-six, and the loss to the Church was irreparable. He united with it in 1855. He was a native of New York city, where he was born in 1817. Mr. Bacon says of him in a notice of his death in his annual survey of the year 1883, "although of a profoundly religious spirit and life, it was not until 1855 that Mr. Crump so far overcame distrust of himself as to make public covenant as a disciple of Christ ; so he was only twenty-eight years in communion here. But from 1865 to 1883, when his renewed resignation was reluctantly accepted, he adorned the office of a deacon, serving the Church and its Head with such modest

fidelity and excellent wisdom and unostentatious self-denial as the earth rarely sees. This death removed a pillar of the church below, 'to make him a pillar in the Temple of our God, and he shall go no more out.' "

34. ADAM F. PRENTIS was chosen to be a deacon October 23, 1867. He joined this Church in 1843. He was a lineal descendant of John Prentis, the blacksmith, who came here in 1652 on the invitation of John Winthrop, Jr., and the townsmen. He was engaged in the whaling business with Deacon Frink, under the firm name of Frink and Prentis. He died July 25, 1878, aged sixty-nine. Mr. Bacon, in speaking of his death in his annual letter for the year 1878, says, "before now I have had occasion to speak, so far as I thought his own most modest taste would permit me, of the loss the church sustained in the death of Deacon Prentis, and how he 'used the office of a deacon well.' He was so quiet, yet so strong a man that few knew the extent of his usefulness, as it fell to the lot of his minister to know it. As the months go by, I miss and mourn my lost assistant even more than I expected I should."

35. JOSHUA C. LEARNED was also chosen October 23, 1867, and served in that office fifteen years. He joined this Church in 1835. He was born in New London, August 19, 1819. He died, after a brief

illness, April 27, 1892, and this Church lost in him another pillar, and faithful supporter, and his pastor a steadfast and valued friend.

36. JESSE H. WILCOX was elected to the office which he now holds November 8, 1878, Mr. Bacon says "with one consent," to succeed Deacon Prentis. He joined this Church by letter from the Church in East Lyme in 1869. He was born in Stonington, October 17, 1828.

37. HON. GEORGE E. STARR was chosen October 18, 1883, and still serves in the office of deacon. He was born in Middletown, Conn., August 24, 1828, and came to New London in 1844. He joined this Church upon confession of faith, March 3, 1878. He was mayor of the city from 1882 to 1885.

38. HON. WILLIAM BELCHER was also chosen October 18, 1883, to the office in which he now serves. He joined this Church by letter from the Church in Amherst College in 1866, from which institution he graduated that year. He is a native of New London, where he was born February 25, 1845. He was reared in the Church of which he is now a valued officer.

39. JAMES E. GODDARD was also elected October 18, 1883. He was born in New London, June 27, 1817. His early life was spent in this Church. In his young manhood he removed to New York to

engage in business. He returned to New London, and, with his family, joined this Church in 1877 by letter from the first Presbyterian Church in Yonkers, N. Y. He died March 29, 1893, aged seventy-six.

The following extracts are taken from an obituary notice of him: "He was a man of great originality. * * * Shakespeare, Burns and Scott were his familiars. * * * He was deeply read in theology, especially among the Puritan divines, whose views he embraced with heartiness, and, it may be added, with immovable conviction. He was equally well read in history. * * * He was a profound reader of the Scriptures, having his regular hours of study and reflection therein. * * * But it was as a man of prayer that he will be best remembered by those who knew him. * * * His Saturdays were spent partly in petitions for the ministry and for their preparation for the Sunday morning, remembering unfailingly his own and neighboring pastors, as well as others known and related to him. * * * On hearing of his release a certain friend said, simply and appropriately, 'the prayers of David, the son of Jesse, are ended.' "

40. HENRY LUFLER was elected to succeed Deacon Goddard June 30, 1893, and was inducted into office by prayer at the communion July 2 of that year. He still serves in the office. He joined this

Church by letter from the Church in Stafford, September 1, 1889. He was born in Hingham, Mass., June 1, 1847.

These forty men, worthy successors of Deacon Stephen and his companions, have served tables in this visible body of Christ since 1651. Like the original seven, they have none of them been of any clerical order, but they were solemnly set apart to the office of deacon as instituted by the New Testament Church.

It seems certain that there were deacons before the Church left Gloucester, who came with it. But we have no means of knowing positively who they were. These forty are the only ones so far as we have any definite knowledge, who have served the Church in this office since 1651. In the early days deacons sometimes officiated, in the absence of the pastor, holding what were called "deacons' meetings." We know that Captain George Denison and Mr. John Tinker rendered such service on several occasions. If these occasions were instances in which "deacons' meetings" were held, then their names must be coupled with that of Deacon Park in the early years of the Church in New London.

XIII.

MEN WHO HAVE ENTERED THE MINISTRY FROM THIS CHURCH.

Those whose names appear in the following pages have been members of this Church, or have been directly or indirectly influenced by it, or have gone forth from its homes into their life work. They are among the fruits which it has borne in its long and eventful career. As these men have gone into the pulpits of other denominations, as well as of the Congregational order, this Church may reap the reward promised, "blessed are ye that sow beside all waters."

1. REV. SIMON BRADSTREET was the eldest son of the third minister of this Church. He was born in New London March 7, 1671. In the records of baptisms is this entry made by his father: "March 12, 1671, my own child, Simon." He graduated from Harvard College in 1693, and was the first native of this town, and the first son of this Church to secure a collegiate education. He preached in Medford in

1696, but left early in the next year, and was ordained at Charlestown, Mass., October 26, 1698, as pastor of the Church of which his distinguished grandmother, Ann Bradstreet, had been a member. He continued in the office till he died, December 31, 1741, after a ministry of forty-three years, aged seventy-one years and ten months. It is said that he was considered one of the first literary characters and best preachers in America. For some years prior to his death he was afraid to preach from his pulpit, and delivered his sermons from the deacons' seat, and without notes. Another says, "he was more celebrated for his learning than for his eloquence, and was a man of great eccentricity. He delivered his sermons extemporaneously * * * and avoiding doctrinal preaching of the Calvinistic school adopted the practical tone of the English divines, of whom Tillotson was his favorite." He was a man of great classical attainments, but of infirm constitution, and desponding temperament, which probably accounts for his reputation for "great eccentricity." Another says, "he was a very learned man, of a strong mind, tenacious memory, and lively imagination. Lt. Gov. Tailer introduced him to Gov. Burnet, who was himself a fine scholar, by saying, 'here is a man who can whistle Greek.' "

His son, Simon, the fifth to bear the name, was

ordained pastor of the Church in Marblehead, Mass., January 4, 1738, and continued till his death, October 5, 1771. These three Simon Bradstreets completed ninety-three years of ministerial life. Rev. Simon Bradstreet was minister in New London seventeen years; his son Simon was minister in Charlestown, Mass., forty-three years; his grandson, Simon, was minister in Marblehead, Mass., thirty-three years.

2. JOSEPH COIT was the second son of Deacon Joseph Coit. The record of his baptism, made by Mr. Bradstreet, is, "April 6, 1673, Joseph Coit's child Joseph." His birth took place a few days before. He joined this Church July 29, 1698. Miss Caulkins says that he "was the first native of New London that received a collegiate education." This is clearly a mistake. For Simon Bradstreet was a native of New London, and graduated from Harvard College four years before Joseph Coit. Then he was the second instead of the first son of this town and Church to secure a collegiate education. Miss Caulkins says that "his name is on the first list of graduates of the seminary founded at Saybrook, which was the germ that expanded into Yale College." He graduated from Harvard College in 1697. He received an honorary degree from Yale in 1702. "He declined a call to Norwich before 1699, then went to Plain-

field," where he was ordained the first pastor of the Church, which was organized January 3, 1705. He ranked high among the ministers of his time. He remained till he was dismissed in March, 1748. He died July, 1750. His name was given, in Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of Connecticut [p. 518] as having had a ministerial life of fifty-two years. According to this his entrance upon the sacred office was in 1698—the year in which he joined this Church, and the year after he graduated from Harvard College.

3. WILLIAM ADAMS was the oldest son of Rev. Eliphalet Adams. He was born October 7, 1710. His father made the following record of his baptism: "November 8, 1710, my own child, William." He was named for his grandfather, Rev. William Adams of Dedham, Mass. He joined this Church February 16, 1735. He graduated from Yale College in 1730, where he was afterwards tutor for two years, 1732 to 1734. He was then licensed to preach, but never was ordained as pastor of a Church. He ministered in various parishes for more than sixty years. He preached first in the North Parish, of New London. It is now Montville. He preached next in North Groton, now Ledyard. He declined a unanimous call to the latter place. After his father's death he occupied the pulpit in New London for nearly three

years as a supply. An attempt to call him to succeed his father is thus recorded by Mr. Hempstead in his diary. "February 23 [1756]. A society meeting. Mr. William Adams negatived, forty-five against forty." After the death of Mr. Woodbridge in 1776, "Rev. William Adams preached about half the time during the first three years." There is a vote of the society November 21, 1780 to employ him, but he evidently supplied before that date. "The larger part of his ministerial labors were given to Shelter Island, where he preached at intervals for over thirty years." He is believed to be the first minister to dwell on the Island. He was there at the time of Whitfield's visit in 1764. [Sprague's Annals]. His last years were spent in New London. He often walked into the country on visits to the farmers, and made it a point to give some religious instruction. He was short and stout, and wore a white wig, and a cocked hat. He usually walked about the streets in a black study gown. He was a good preacher, but in no wise eminent. He was never married. It is said that he often "congratulated himself on never having been incumbered with wife or Parish." He died in New London, September 25, 1798, aged eighty-three, and lies by the side of his brother, Deacon Pygan Adams, in the ancient cemetery.

4. JOHN AVERY. This name appears in Contri-

butions to the Ecclesiastical History of Connecticut, on the list of ministers raised up by this Church. It is probable that he was the John Avery who graduated from Yale in 1777, was licensed by the New Haven East Association in 1778, was settled in Stamford, January, 1779, and died September, 1791. Rev. John Avery of Norwich writes that he was probably "son of Jonathan, who was son of James 2nd. He was born October 9, 1752," and was thirty-nine years of age at his death.

5. JOSHUA HUNTINGTON was the second son of Gen. Jedediah Huntington. He was born in Norwich, January 31, 1786, but came to New London with his father in early childhood. He was graduated from Yale College in the class of 1804, of which John C. Calhoun, Abel McEwen, Ezra Stiles Ely, Bennet Tyler, were members. Mr. McEwen was his college chum and spoke of him as a young man of "very acceptable address, both private and public," and as having "discretion," and "good common sense." He was converted in a revival which visited the college in his sophomore year, and decided to enter the ministry. He had an impediment in his speech which might have proved fatal to his purpose. But so firm was his conviction of duty, and so earnest was his desire, that with persistent determination he set about overcoming it, and succeeded. He studied

theology with Dr. Dwight, and then sought training in pastoral duties in the family of Rev. Asahel Hooker of Goshen, Conn. He was licensed by the New London Association in 1806, and began to preach when but twenty, and that, too, with great acceptance. He received a call from the Church in Middletown, Conn., and from the Old South Church in Boston to be the colleague with Dr. Eckley, on the same day. About the same time he received a call from another Church in a pleasant and populous town. Certainly these calls were proof that he was a young man of rare promise, which his future fulfilled. This was very flattering to one so young in years, yet another says, "We never heard that it produced in him any indication of vanity." After serious deliberation, and following judicious advice, he accepted the call to the Old South Church in Boston, where he was ordained May 18, 1808. The following action of this Church refers to this event: "Lord's day, May 1st, 1808, after public worship a letter missive from the Church in Marlborough street, Boston, [the Old South] was communicated to this Church. It requested the assistance of the pastor and such other delegates as the Church might appoint in the ecclesiastical council to be convened at Boston, on the 18th of May, 1808, for the purpose of ordaining Mr. Joshua Huntington colleague Pastor with the Rev.

Joseph Eckley over the Church in Marlborough street. Deacons Jedediah Huntington and Guy Richards were appointed delegates from this Church for the purpose above mentioned." Dr. Eckley died about 1811, and Mr. Huntington became sole pastor of that historic Church. He died in Groton, Mass., while returning home from a journey for his health, on Saturday, September 11, 1819. In so great esteem was he held that the whole religious community of Boston was deeply moved at his death. He was instrumental in the formation of the American Education Society.

6. DANIEL HUNTINGTON, third son of Deacon Jedediah Huntington, was born at Norwich, October 17, 1788, but removed to New London with his father while yet a child. He graduated from Yale College in the class of 1807, and became a member of this Church February 28, 1809. He was licensed to preach by the New London Association in 1811. He was a resident licentiate at Andover Theological Seminary in 1812—the first student of that kind on the list. He was ordained pastor of the Church in North Bridgewater, now the city of Brockton, Mass., October 28, 1812, where he remained till his health compelled him to relinquish his charge in 1832, when he returned to New London. His ministry "was attended from time to time with the demonstration of

the spirit and with power, so that great numbers were added to the Lord.” After a temporary respite from pastoral labors he so far regained his health that he was able “to gratify his fine literary taste in the instruction of successive classes of young ladies in the higher branches of an educational course, while residing in New London.” But his heart yearned for the pastorate. After seven years he received a call from a portion of his original Church, which he accepted. This was about 1839. The new Church, a colony from the old, had been organized in 1837, in that portion of Brockton known as Campello. In this southern section of his former field he spent thirteen years, “winning souls to Christ.” In 1852 he returned to New London, where he lived till he died. His separation from his people at Campello occasioned many tears and much anguish of spirit, and showed how strongly he had intrenched himself in the hearts of his people. After his return to New London he continued to preach the gospel. His last sermon was delivered in the chapel at Mohegan, just four weeks before his death. He was an original member of the Second Church. But on his return to New London from Campello he brought his letter to the First Church, in 1854.

In a historical sketch of the Second Church is the following notice of him: “The Rev. Daniel Hunting-

ton, though never an acting pastor like Mr. Hurlbut, was for a number of months acting preacher in the third Sunday service. He led the service of song. He baptized five out of forty-eight children of the Church. His long ministries at Bridgewater, Mass., before and after this date are written on earth. May we not believe that his brief and unofficial work done here where he died is written in heaven? Almost his last words before his death, May 21, 1858, were, 'let me go, for the morning breaketh.' It is to be remembered that the organization of the Second Church took place during the period of his first respite from pastoral labors, in 1835. A sketch of him in the Congregational Year Book for 1859 says that "but for his unfeigned humility and the extreme modesty that imposed a constant restraint on the forth-putting of his native genius * * * he had shone with far superior brilliancy in the starry firmament of earth's ambition, though less splendidly in that nobler firmament where stars never set, and the sun no more goes down." He had a fine literary taste. But best of all, he had a passion for souls, and the constant additions to the Church during his ministry prove that he was a preacher of rare spiritual power.

7. NATHANIEL HEWIT, D. D., was born in New London, August 28, 1788. He graduated from Yale

College in the class of 1808. He studied a year at Andover with the class of 1816. He was licensed to preach by the New London Association in 1811. He was ordained July 5, 1815, as pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Plattsburg, N. Y., where he remained till 1817. January, 1818, he became pastor of the ancient Congregational Church in Fairfield. December, 1827, he was dismissed to become agent of the American Temperance Society, with Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Connecticut as his field. He remained in this work till December, 1830, when he became pastor of the Second Congregational Church in Bridgeport. This same year Amherst College conferred on him the honorary degree of D. D. After a pastorate of nearly twenty-three years he was, at his own request, dismissed September, 1853. In October of that year, and apparently to follow Dr. Hewit, seventy-eight members of the Second Church "were dismissed by their own request to form a Presbyterian Church, of which Dr. Hewit became pastor." He remained in this office till he died in Bridgeport, February 10, 1867, aged nearly seventy-nine years.

He had distinguished himself before 1826 "by maintaining, not only at home but in his exchanges with other pastors, the duty of entire abstinence from the use of spirituous liquors, except as a medicine,

and as prescribed by a temperate physician." He addressed the General Association of this State upon this subject, at their meeting in Stratford in 1827, with so great eloquence and power that a resolution was called forth from that conservative body, endorsing the principles of the society which he represented, and pledging the members to use their influence "as pastors to prevent entirely the use and all abuses of strong drink." He was preacher before the General Association in 1840, and its moderator in 1853. Two of his sons became priests of the Roman Catholic Church.

8. NATHAN DOUGLASS was born in New London January 31, 1787. He was a son of Capt. Ebenezer Douglas, a member of this Church, of "decided Christian character," who died Sunday night, September 3, 1798. Nathan was a lineal descendant, of the fifth generation from the first Deacon William Douglas. He early became a professed disciple of Christ, and joined this Church April 5, 1807, when twenty years of age. He said of himself at that period, in the words of the psalmist, "I thought on my ways, and turned my feet unto thy testimonies." With a deep conviction of sin, he turned from all the human devices, which brought him no relief, to find peace in the blood and righteousness of Christ. Mr. McEwen, who was at that time the pastor of the

Church, evidently saw traits in the young man which promised usefulness in the ministry, and so started him on a course of education for that work. He graduated from Middlebury College, Vermont, in the class of 1813. He studied theology at Andover two years, in the class of 1816, and then one year with the famous Rev. Edward Payson, D. D. He went to Alfred, Maine, in July, 1816, where he was ordained pastor of the Church in that town, November 6 of that year. His ministry continued till July 1827, and was signally blessed by seasons of religious interest. He was greatly respected and beloved by his people, as appears from resolutions passed by the Church, which expressed "the most cordial friendships and love for their late pastor and teacher." January 13, 1829, Mr. Douglas removed to East Saint Albans, Maine. A Church was organized there June 24, 1830, which he served as acting pastor till June 12, 1833, when he was installed. Here, too, his ministry was blessed with seasons of spiritual refreshing. He continued at East Saint Albans till September 14, 1846, when he was duly dismissed by council. This was his last pastorate. On leaving it he served for twenty years "as a domestic missionary" in Maine, till he died at Bangor, December 16, 1866, at the age of eighty years, and a month over fifty years after his ordination. The *Bangor Whig and Courier* said of him, "he

took a deep interest in all that pertained to the welfare of the Church and of the State, and was the founder of the State and County Conferences in Maine. Though he lived to the advanced age of nearly eighty years, he retained to a remarkable degree his mental powers, and was an earnest advocate of vital religious and civil liberty.” Prof. George Shepard, of Bangor Theological Seminary, said of him, “he instructed by his preaching. He was a good pastor, and so edified the Church; watchful of its order and discipline. He brought souls into the kingdom by his doctrine, and then built them in, by his vigilant care.”

9. JOHN ROSS was born in Dublin, Ireland, July 23, 1783. He joined this Church, August 21, 1808. He graduated from Middlebury College in the same class with Nathan Douglas, 1813. He studied over two years at Princeton; was licensed to preach by the New London Association in 1815; was ordained by Presbytery in 1817 at Redstone, Pa.; was pastor at Somerset, Pa., Ripley, O., and Richmond, Ind., from 1817 to 1829; was home missionary in Ohio and Indiana from 1829 to 1843; was colporter from 1843 to 1849; served at Burlington, Ind., from 1849 to 1850, and died at Tipton, Ind., March 11, 1876, aged eighty-three.

10. JOSEPH HURLBUT was born in New London,

August 22, 1799. He graduated from Yale College in 1818. He studied at Andover one year in the class of 1822, but graduated from Princeton. He was acting pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., from 1822 to 1823. October 25, 1823, he was ordained pastor of the Third Presbyterian Church, Albany, N. Y., where he remained till 1826. He was without charge in New York from 1826 to 1832 and in New London from 1832 to 1835. He was acting pastor of the Second Church till March 6, 1837; then a missionary to the Mohegan Indians till 1862; chaplain at Fort Trumbull from 1862 to 1867; after that he resided in New London till his death. A notice of him in an historical sketch of the Second Church says, "the Rev. Joseph Hurlbut preached and administered the ordinances till a stated pastor could be obtained. This was about two years, till March 6, 1837. His labors were gratuitous. They were marked by the ingathering of one hundred and thirteen members. Mr. Hurlbut had also borne one-quarter of the expense of building the first house of worship. He prayed at the last sacrament in the new house before his death, which occurred suddenly, June 5, 1875."

11. JOHN FERGUSON is among those whose names Mr. Bacon gives as having gone into the ministry from this Church. He is referred to in a *New Lon-*

don Telegram for 1882, in a notice of the death of Mr. Thomas Updike Robertson. After leaving school he "served an apprenticeship with a tobacconist, a Scotchman named Ferguson, who resided on John street." "Mr. Ferguson afterwards removed to Providence and became a Congregationalist minister." Mr. Ferguson never was a member of this Church, but he was identified with it during his residence in town. He preached for a time in the town of Attleboro, Mass., and also in another parish in the western part of the same State. Nothing further could be learned about him.

12. THOMAS HUNTINGTON was born in Norwich, December 4, 1793. He joined this Church in 1814. He went to Brooklyn, Conn., about 1820, became a Baptist, and was ordained as an evangelist and pastor September 3, 1834. He served in this capacity several years, and then became a physician. He died in Brooklyn, December 1, 1867, aged seventy-four years.

13. WILLIAM HARRIS was a son of this Church, and his early life was spent in it. He joined the Baptists and became a licensed preacher in that denomination. He was never settled, but he had charge of a Baptist Church in Hadlyme for about four years. He became blind. The last of his life he was a member of Saint James' Episcopal Church. He died in New London.

14. CHARLES THOMPSON was born in Stratford. In early life he was in the drug store of his uncle, Dr. Isaac Thompson, in New London. About 1816 he left the store to pursue his studies with reference to preparation for the ministry. In 1823 he married Hannah Miner, who had joined this Church in 1814, and at once went as a home missionary to Danduff, Pa. He came to Seymour, Conn., June 28, 1830, where he remained till June, 1833. He came to Salem in October of that year, and remained till he died, March, 1855; nearly twenty-two years.

15. JOHN CAULKINS COIT was born in New London in 1797. He graduated from Yale College in 1818. He was a lawyer, and settled at Cheraw, S. C. He afterwards entered the Presbyterian ministry, and became pastor of an Old School Presbyterian Church in the same town. He was a son of David and Betsy Caulkins Coit, both of whom joined this Church in 1831. He died in 1863.

16. THOMAS WINTHROP COIT. D. D., LL. D., was born in New London, June 28, 1803. He was a son of Thomas Coit, M. D., who joined this Church June 29, 1800, and Mary W. Saltonstall Coit, who joined this Church September 20, 1795. He was baptized by Rev. Henry Channing, August 28, 1803. He united with the Church in 1821; the year in which he graduated from Yale College. He studied part of

a year at Andover, in the class of 1826; was at Princeton Theological Seminary from 1824 to 1825; took deacon's orders in the Episcopal Church June 7, 1826; was ordained as a priest November 14, 1827. He was rector of St. Peter's Church, Salem, Mass., from 1827 to 1829; of Christ Church, Cambridge, Mass., from 1829 to 1834; was president of Transylvania University, Kentucky, from 1834 to 1837; was rector of Trinity Church, New Rochelle, N. Y., from 1839 to 1849; was professor of Ecclesiastical History at Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., from 1849 to 1854; was rector of St. Paul's Church, Troy, N. Y., from 1854 to 1872; was professor of Church History at Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn., from 1873 till he died in 1885, aged eighty-two. He received the degree of D. D. from Columbia College in 1834, and of LL. D. from Trinity College in 1853. He was an author of some repute. Among the works produced by his pen are the following: A Theological Commonplace Book, Remarks on Norton's Statement of Reasons, The Bible and Apocrypha in Paragraphs and Parallelisms, Townsend's Chronological Bible, Puritanism; a Churchman's Defence Against Its Aspersions, &c. As will be gathered from this brief outline, he was a prominent and influential man in the Episcopal Church. The blood which flowed in his veins from Puritan John Coite told.

17. GURDON SALTONSTALL COIT, D. D., was a younger brother of the preceding. He was born in New London, October 28, 1808. He was baptized by Dr. McEwen, February 10, 1809. He graduated from Yale College in 1828, at the age of nearly twenty. He was a year at Andover Theological Seminary, in the class of 1831, which was one of the most remarkable classes which ever graduated from that institution. He was ordained deacon in the Episcopal Church August 8, 1830, and a priest December 16, 1832. He served with Trinity Church, Milton, Conn., in 1830-31; with St. Peter's Church, Plymouth, Conn., in 1832-3; with St. John's Church, Bridgeport, Conn., from 1833 to 1862; was chaplain of U. S. Volunteers, in 1863; served with Christ Church, West Haven, Conn., in 1864-65; with St. Michael's Church, Naugatuck, Conn., from 1866 to 1868. He died at Southport, Conn., November 10, 1869, aged sixty-one. He received the degree of D. D. from Trinity College in 1853.

18. ROBERT MC EWEN, D. D., son of Rev. Abel McEwen, D. D., was born in New London, June 22, 1808. He was baptized September 11, 1808. He joined this Church in 1826, at the age of eighteen. He graduated from Yale College in 1827; taught in the New Haven Grammar School two years; was tutor in the college from 1829 to 1832. In 1833 he was grad-

uated from the Yale Divinity School, was licensed by the New Haven West Association, and was ordained as an evangelist. He served as a home missionary in Michigan till 1835, when he was called to the South Church in Middletown, Conn., where he was installed in May of that year. He remained till August, 1838. From 1842 to 1861 he was pastor of the Church in Enfield, Mass., where his ministry was abundantly blessed. Under his influence a number of young people were raised up to enter the ministry of the gospel, either as preachers, or as missionaries, or as the efficient wives of clergymen. In 1861 he returned to New London, where he remained until his death, August 29, 1883, at the age of seventy-four years and two months. He received the honorary degree of D. D. from Amherst College in 1858, while yet in his Enfield pastorate. Mr. Bacon, in a notice of his death in his annual survey of 1883, pays the following tribute to his memory: "Since 1861 his home and his work have been in New London, where in unofficial and unpaid ministry, he led a life as useful as it was modest, and as blessed as it was generous. Never was there such a parishioner as this retired minister became." His wife, who joined the Church in the same year, 1826, outlived him fourteen years, and reached the ripe age of eighty-seven years and four months, after having

walked in the fellowship of the Church for over seventy-one years.

19. ELISHA C. JONES was a native of Hartland, where he was born in 1808. But he joined this Church by letter in 1831, and seems to have gone from it into the ministry. He graduated from Yale College in 1831; taught in New London from 1831 to 1833; was tutor at Yale in 1834-5; was licensed by the New London Association in 1834; married his wife, Julia Chappell, from this Church; and was ordained pastor at Southington, June 28, 1837, where he remained till he died March 9, 1872, aged sixty-four years. He was a Fellow of Yale College from July 1862, until his death.

20. ROBERT COIT LEARNED was born in New London, August 31, 1817. His baptism is recorded by Dr. McEwen. He joined this Church in 1831. He was doubtless a fruit of the religious interest of that year. He graduated from Yale College in 1837; studied two years at Yale Theological Seminary, and graduated from Andover Seminary in 1841. He was ordained September 23, 1843, pastor at Twinsburg, Ohio, where he remained till 1846. He was pastor at Canterbury, Conn., from 1847 to 1858; at Berlin, Conn., from 1858 to 1861; at Plymouth, Conn., from 1861 to 1865, where he died April 19, 1867.

21. GEORGE RICHARDS was born in New Lon-

don, November 2, 1816. He was a grandson of Deacon Jedediah Huntington. He graduated from Yale College in 1840. He studied one year at Andover, but graduated from Yale Theological Seminary in 1845. He was tutor at Yale in 1844-5. He was ordained pastor of the Central Congregational Church, Boston, October 8, 1845, where he remained till 1859. He was acting pastor at Litchfield, from 1861 to 1865, and pastor of the First Church, Bridgeport, from 1866 till he died there October 20, 1870. He was Fellow of Yale University from July, 1868, till his death.

22. JOHN EUCLID ELLIOTT was born in New London, October 22, 1829. He was a son of Euclid, and Lucy Smith (Coit) Elliott. He joined this Church in 1849. He was in Marietta College, Ohio, in 1853-4, but graduated from Amherst College in 1857, and from Hartford Theological Seminary in 1860. He was acting pastor at Barkhamstead, Conn., from 1860 to 1863, was ordained at Ridgebury, Conn., May 6, 1863; was dismissed May 16, 1865; was acting pastor at Higganum, Conn., from 1865 to 1867; at Hadley, Mass., from 1867 to 1868; at Lucas Grove, Muscatine, Iowa, from 1868 to 1870; at Columbus, Neb., from 1870 to 1874; at South Glastonbury, Conn., from 1874 to 1879; at Newington, Conn., from 1880 to 1884; at Bridgewater, Conn.,

from 1884 to 1887 ; without charge at North Yakima, Washington, from 1887, till his death, January 19, 1888, at the age of fifty-eight.

23. **WILLIAM H. STARR**, a son of Deacon William H. Starr, was born in Groton, October 20, 1834. He joined this Church in 1857 ; graduated from the Wesleyan University at Middletown, Conn., in 1859 ; entered the ministry of the Methodist Church in 1862 ; joined the Providence Conference in 1863, and was ordained in 1865. He returned to the Congregational fellowship, and was settled over the Church in Thornton, R. I., in 1891, where he is still. Another writes of him, "in all the relations of life he is everything that is lovely and of good report."

24. **FREDRICK L. CHAPELL** was born in Waterford, Conn., November 9, 1836. He graduated from Yale College in 1860, and from Rochester Theological Seminary in 1864. He entered the ministry of the Baptist Church, and was ordained at Middletown, Ohio, in 1864, where he remained till July 1, 1871 ; then he was at Evanston, Ill., till July 1, 1878. Then he was at Janesville, Wis., till May 1, 1881, when he went to Flemington, N. J., where he remained till July 1, 1889. He then accepted a position in what is now called The Gordon Missionary Training School, in Boston, Mass., where he now is. He never joined this Church, but was a constant attend-

ant upon its services, until he joined the Huntington Street Baptist Church, at the advice of Dr. McEwen, on account of his views upon the question of baptism.

25. THOMAS ALLENDER was born in Birmingham, England, November 10, 1836. He joined this Church in 1860; graduated from Andover Theological Seminary in 1864; was acting pastor at Assabet, Mass., in 1865-66, where he was ordained January 4, 1866; was pastor at West Hampton, Mass., from 1866, till he died in New London, September 17, 1869.

26. JOHN ALLENDER was born in New London, October 11, 1840. He united with this Church in 1865. He graduated from Chicago Theological Seminary in 1868. After a summer spent at St. Catherine and Laclede, Mo., he was engaged, November 10, 1868, for one year. February 23, the next year, he was ordained at Laclede. He had charge of the two Churches for two years, and then remained six months longer with the Church in Laclede, till May, 1871. September 15, 1871, he began at Prairie City, Ia., and closed his labors there December 22, 1872, but continued to supply the Church till the spring of 1873. May 11 of that year he began work at Glenwood, where he remained three years. In May, 1876, he was called to Red Oak, Ia., where he remained till September, 1884. He then returned

east and took a post graduate course at Yale Theological Seminary, from 1884 to 1886. Meanwhile he was with the Taylor Church, New Haven, from 1885 to 1887. He was afterwards with the Church in Champaign, Ill., from April, 1888, till August, 1892. He was without charge in New Haven till December 10, 1893, when he began at Middlefield, Conn., where he is still laboring.

27. C. PERLEY TINKER was born in New London, July 26, 1864. He joined this Church in 1883. He fitted for college at the Bulkeley High School, and entered the Wesleyan University, at Middletown, Conn., from which he graduated in 1889. He studied theology at the theological school of Boston University, and graduated in 1892. He entered the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and was ordained to deacon's orders April 3, 1892, and to the full ministry April 5, 1896. His charges have been as follows: Ozone Park, L. I., 1892 and 1893; Floral Park, L. I., from 1894 to 1896; Bay Shore, L. I., 1897, where he is stationed at this writing. In all his charges he has proved himself to be a good soldier of the Lord. He is the son of Hon. George F. Tinker, who, for more than a decade has been the efficient superintendent of the Sunday school of this Church. Although Mr. Tinker has chosen to be an under shepherd in another fold, he is a child of the First Church

of Christ. Of his relation to it he writes: "I owe no small debt of gratitude to the dear old First Church of Christ. Owing to its precious services, together with the good example of godly parents, I am able to say with truth, I believe, that from eight years of age till twenty-one, when I left for college, I scarcely missed a single service in the sanctuary, Sunday school room, or lecture room. Earlier still my religious destiny was bent, in part, in the infant class room of the Sabbath school. Particularly was a deep impression made by a wall motto, 'Thou God Seest Me,' which has hung from the wall of my memory almost every week since. My first strong and definite personal revolution was occasioned, when I was about twelve, by a sermon from the lips of Rev. E. W. Bacon, upon 'I will make you fishers of men.' That clear and logical discourse so impressed itself upon my mind that on the way home from Church I exclaimed to a companion, Charles E. Reeves, now a gifted minister of the gospel, 'Well, Charlie, if we cannot be fishers of *men*, we *can* be fishers of *boys*.' Whereupon our ministerial career actually and immediately began by the organizing of a Saturday religious service for boys. I owe much to the extraordinary devotion of my Sabbath school teacher, Mrs. Samuel Dennis. * * * I owe my interest in world-wide missions largely to the First Church, also the Puritan

zeal I seem to have for the rugged piety of New England Congregationalism. My pivotal decision for Christ, which resulted in unmistakable conversion, I owe to the Huntington Street Baptist Church, but my early Christian development was strongly impressed with the First Church seal. For it was that Church which initiated me into the work of soul saving, which is now such a passion in my ministry. Pardon me if I add that I owe positive gratitude to Dr. S. Leroy Blake, the present pastor, for the inspiration of his godly missionary zeal, which, ever since I knew him first, has been a sheet anchor to my Christian life."

28. JAMES HUNTER was born in Scotland. He first came to New London in connection with the Salvation Army, in whose work he developed great spiritual power. He joined this Church in 1889, by letter from the Church in Brooklyn of which Dr. T. DeWitt Talmage was pastor. He was educated for the ministry at Hartford Theological Seminary, which he entered in 1889; at Edinburgh University, and at Yale Theological Seminary, from which he graduated in 1892. He entered the ministry of the Presbyterian Church at Devil's Lake City, North Dakota, the same year. At this writing he is in California.

THOMAS DOUGLAS was born in Waterford, March 29, 1807. He graduated from Yale College in 1831.

He studied two years at Andover in the class of 1837, intending to enter the ministry. But his health compelled him to relinquish this purpose, and he removed to California, where he resided at San Jose, and was teacher and farmer. Later he removed to New Jersey, and then to New London, where he died January 27, 1895, aged almost eighty-eight years.

There are others who, though they did not enter the ministry directly from this Church, are yet more or less closely identified with it through their family connections. One of these is REV. JOSHUA COIT, the Secretary of the Massachusetts Home Missionary Society. He was baptized by Dr. McEwen, in this Church, in 1832. His father afterwards became a member of the Second Congregational Church. But the roots of the religious life of his family are in the First Church. For it descended from John Coit, who came to New London with Mr. Blinman in 1650, through his second son Joseph, who was a deacon of this Church. Mr. Coit was born in New London, February 4, 1832. He graduated from Yale College in 1853, and from Andover in 1856. After studying two years in Germany at the Universities of Halle and Berlin, he was ordained, October 13, 1860, as pastor of the Church in Brookfield, Mass. He was pastor of the Lawrence Street Church, Lawrence,

Mass., from 1874 to 1883, when he was called to his present position.

DWIGHT W. LEARNED, Ph. D., D. D., is a son of Rev. Robert C. Learned, who was a son of this Church. Dr. Learned was never a member of it, but his family connections are still in it. He can be claimed as a grandson of the First Church. He was born in Canterbury, October 12, 1848. He graduated from Yale College in 1870. He received the degree of Ph. D. from his Alma Mater in 1873, and the degree of D. D. from the same institution in 1896. He was ordained, and went to Japan as a missionary of the A. B. C. F. M. in 1878, to be connected with the Doshisha in Kyoto, as a professor in its theological department at the opening of that institution. He is still in Japan.

JOHN CALVIN GODDARD was a son of Deacon James E. Goddard, and is therefore a grandson of this Church. He was born in Brooklyn, N. Y., September 18, 1852. He fitted for college at the old Bartlett High School from which he graduated in 1869. He entered Yale the same year and graduated in 1873. He writes "I went to Texas for health and engaged in business there until 1878, when I entered the Chicago Theological Seminary, graduating in 1881." June 23 of that year he had charge, from the beginning, of what was then called the

Western Avenue Branch of the First Congregational Church of Chicago, but which has since been known as The Covenant Congregational Church. From this charge he came to his present field of labor, in Salisbury, Conn., where he was installed October 14, 1884.

Writing of his connection with this Church he says, "I was a Sunday school boy and an attendant of the old First Church for five or six years discontinuously prior to entering college, and certainly received my strongest religious impressions under its roof. I think I owe as much to the prayer meetings of the old conference room as anything, and well remember one occasion when Deacon Crump and myself made up the entire meeting, which he conducted throughout. It was due to the helpful influence of a member of the First Church, Dr. Robert McEwen, that I was confirmed in my choice of the ministry."

If to those who have entered the ministry were added the names of the men who have gone from this Church, and its families, into the other learned professions, to occupy conspicuous places, the list would be a long one. Those whom a church raises up, and sends forth to their life-work, are among its fruits. Through them its influence widens out to touch broader fields than its own immediate parish; widens out to touch a world and help lift it. In this way this

Puritan mother, and pioneer of all the Churches of every name in Southeastern Connecticut, has contributed her share to the world's advancement, and has brought strength and blessing to Churches of other names and polity, some of whose most efficient members had their early training in this fold. "By their fruits ye shall know them." Judged by these, the record of this ancient Church is one which it need not blush to own; and what it has done for the kingdom in these more than two hundred and fifty years of life is only a pledge of what it may be expected to do in the future, if the coming men and women are as loyal to God as the founders were.

INDEX.

Adams, Rev. Eliphalet, 3; baptized Governor's son, 261; sermon on Governor's death, 262.

Adams, Dea. Pygan, 273.

Adams, Rev. William, 296.

Allender, Rev. Joho, 316; Rev. Thomas, 315.

Altar set up in the wilderness, 31.

Andros, Sir Edmund, 110, 113, 114, 147, 199, 244.

Anniversaries of Church, time for, 6.

Autientest Burial Place, 37. 64, 72, 99, 143, 270, 271, 274.

Anniversaries of Church, time for, 6.

Autientest Burial Place, 37. 64, 72, 99, 143, 270, 271, 274.

Arnold, Dea. Joho, 278, 282.

Avery, James, 26, 41, 43, 46, 55, 66, 73, 74, 120, 121, 158.

Avery, Rev. John, 297, 298.

Bailey, Lydia, 42, 128, 156, 157.

Baptists in Groton, 221.

Baptized children, relation to Church, 168-170.

Baru meeting house, 68, 69, 70, 73.

Barnett, Kev. Thomas, 192, 193.

Belcher, Dea. William, 290.

Bell, the first, 199; presented by Winthrop, 210.

Blinman, 10; in Gloucester, 25, 60; men who followed him, 25-30, 66; in Pequot, 1, 13, 62; various items about, 33, 35, 36, 43; involved in controversy, 44, 46, 50; came to America, etc., 52, 55, 56, 57, 59; trouble in Marshfield, 58, 59; testimony to, 59-61; man of peace, 60, 75, 77; why he left Gloucester, 62, 63; contract with, 63; grants of land to, 63-66; where his house stood, 65; Blinman meeting house, 70-73; his ministry acceptable, 74; sent to Boston, 75; preached in Mystic, 78-80; to Indians, 81; ended his own ministry and left New London, 67, 82; called to Newfoundland, at Bristol, England, 83; letters, 84-88; his children, 89, death, 55, 90.

Bonndary disputes, 242-244.

Bradstreet, Ann, 148, 149, 294.

Bradstreet, Gov. Simon, 30, 147, 148.

Bradstreet, Rev. Simon, 2, 34, 38, 41; his call, 120; arrival in New London, etc., 120-123, 124, 125; salary increased, 124, 136; administering sacraments; ad^olesions, etc., 126-131; baptisms by, 128; no half-way covenant, 129, 157; no marriages, 131; Bradstreet meeting house, 131-136; his decline, 136; journal, 139-142; death, etc., 142, 143; remembrances, marriage, children, etc., 144-146; his grandfather, father and mother, 147-149; letters, 149-153.

Bradstreet, Rev. Simon, Jr., 145, 146, 293.

Brewster, Jonathan, 23, 24.

Brewster, Rev. Nathaniel, 119.

Brooks, Dea. Thaddens, 282.

Bruen, Obadiah, 3, 25, 26, 44, 46, 47, 55, 61, 62, 65, 66, 98, 160, 161.

Bulkeley, Rev. Gershom, birth and ancestry, 95, 96, 98; contract with, 99-102; left Church voluntarily, 102, 111; move to ordain, 103; signs of uneasiness, 104, 110; efforts to keep him fail, 105; reasons for going, 105-110; what Dr. Chapin said of him, 109, 115; went to Wethersfield, 111; medical skill, 112; in politics, 109-115; what Dr. Chauncy said, 113; his will, death, etc., 116-118.

Bulkeley, Rev. Peter, 29, 96, 97; his widow, 98, 99, 122.

Cape Ann Lane, 33, 62, 67.

Caulkins, Hugh, 44, 45, 66, 69, 160, 275.

Chapell, Rev. F. L., 315.

Chapman, Dea. Oliver, 278.

Charter, the, 9, 12, 114, 244, 246.

Churches, nine oldest, 54; permitted by legislature, etc., 39.

Cleaveland, Dea. Wm. P., 284.

Coit, Rev. Gurdon Saltonstall, 311; John, 27, 44, 46, 66, 160; Rev. John Caulkias, 309; Dea. Joseph, 27, 202, 270; Rev. Joseph 295; Rev. Joshua, 320; Rev. Thomas Winthrop, 309.

Cuggshall, Dea. W. H., 286.

Connecticut, planting of, etc., 10, 11, 12, 20, 21, 242, 244.

Contribution box, not new, 121.

Cotton, Rev. John, 10, 11, 12, 182.

Crump, Dea. W. C., 288.

Curfew, its beginning, 211.

Daughter, first of the Church, 138; second, 220, 221.

Davenport, Rev. John, 10, 12, 21, 131, 163, 164.

Deacons' meetings, 13, 92, 292.

Denison, Capt. George, 26, 44, 74, 78, 80, 92, 158-160, 292; General married Bradstreet, 145.

Dorchester Church, 10, 32, 49.

Douglas, Rev. Nathan, 304; Dea. William, 41, 43, 105, 119, 120, 123, 124, 130, 141, 158, 268, 269; Dea. William, Jr., 270; Dea. William, third, 275.

Drum to call to meeting, etc.. 68, 71, 70.

Dudley, Ann, 143, 148, 149, 294..

Elliot, Rev. John, 81, 119; Rev. J. E., 314.

Exodus from England, reasons for, 16.

First Church, 1, 2, 3, 4, 6; emigrated from Gloucester, 10, 33, 50; first records, 41, 42, 126; not formed in Conn., 39, 40; first list of members, 41; where and when organized, 47-52; number in order of formation, 53, 54; early parish, 95; early members, 154-161.

Fosdyke, Dea. Thomas, 273.

Founders, character of, 29, 30, 228.

Friuk, Dea. Andrew, 287.

Goddard, Dea. J. E., 290; Rev. J. C., 321.

Gratuity voted the Town, 210, 231.

Green, testimony to Puritans, 17.

Greeo, Dea. Timothy, 272, 274; Dea. Timothy, the second, 276.

Half-way covenant, 75, 108, 110, 129, 162-174, 206, 207.

Harris, Dea. Joseph, 274; Rev. William, 308.

Hempstead, Dea. John, 274; Joshua, 157, 272, 274.

Hewitt, Rev. Nathaniel, 302.

Hill, Ruth, 42, 128, 156, 160.

Hooke, Rev. Thomas, drafted Constitution of Conn., 9; democratic spirit and reasons for not remaining in Mass., 11, 29; led Church from Cambridge to Hartford, 10, 20, 48; his constitution the beginning of democracy, 21; an able divine, 97; views on baptism, 131, 163-165.

Hough, Deacon William, 41, 141, 156, 269.

Hunter, Rev. James, 319.

Huntington, Dea. Jedediah, 279; Rev. Daniel, 300; Rev. Joshua, 298; Rev. Thomas, 308.

Hurlbut, Rev. Joseph, 307.

Jones, Rev. Elisha C., 313.

Laud, Archbishop, 16, 66.

Learned, Rev. Dwight, 320; Dea. Ebcnezer, 285; Dea. J. C., 289; Rev. R. C., 313.

Legacy, Liveen, 213-215.

Lester, Andrew, 27, 44, 66, 160.

Lufier, Dea. Henry, 291.

Mauwaring, Dea. Robert, 276.

Marshfield, 35, 55, 67-59, 62.

Mather, Rev. Cotton, 262; Rev. Increase, letters to, 149-153; Nathaniel, 28; Richard, 49.

Mayflower, the compact of, 11.

Meeting House, the first, 70-74; the Bradstreet, controversy over adjusted, 132; finished, 198; burned, 208, 209; the Saltonstall, 209, 210.

Meeting House Hill, 37, 64, 65, 67, 68.

Miuer, Dea. Clement, 24, 127, 271; Thomas, 23, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 78, 79, 90, 91, 92, 99, 109, 123, 127, 139, 155, 156, 158, 159, 160, 265, 266-268.

Morgan James, 41, 44, 120, 121.

New Haven planted, 10, 21; half-way covenant in, 164.

Newman, Rev. Antipas, 91, 92.

Noyes, Rev. James, 138, 239.

Oakes, Rev. Edward, 191.

Otis, Dea. Asa, 286.

Palfrey, 107, 110.

Park, Robert, 25, 66, 68, 69, 160; Dea. Thomas, 25, 44, 66, 136, 159, 266; Dea. William, 120, 121, 266.

Parish Way, 76, 186, 187.

Parson, the early a farmer, 64; in politics, 232-234.

Peck, Dea. Stephen, 294.

Pequot planted, 10, 13, 15, 66, 67.

Perkius, Dea. Elias, 283.

Peters, Rev. Thomas, 12, 13, 32, 37.

Plumbe, Dea. John, 271.

Prentis, Dea. A. F., 289.

Puritanism, 12, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21.
 Puritans, 22, 29, 30, 36.
 Richards, Rev. George, 313; Dea. Guy, 281.
 Rogerenes, 137, 138, 175-190; at present, 189.
 Rogers, Bathsheba, 177, 178, 183; James, 41, 99, 137, 175, 176, 182; John, 137, 177, 178, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 186, 188, 212, 213; Samuel, 157.
 Ross, Rev. John, 306.
 Rice, Goodman, 156, 160.
 Salary by subscription, 198.
 Saltonstall, Gurdon, 3, 30; called, 193; joined the Church, ordained, etc., 195; ancestry, 196, 197; accessions under, 201-206; baptisms, half-way covenant, etc., 206-208; marriages by, 208; collision with Rogerenes, 212; strict disciplinarian, 216, 217; complaints against, etc., 218-220; as a preacher, 222-227; chosen governor, 230, 232, 236; steps leading thereto, 234-236; Saybrook synod, 237-239; territorial disputes, 242, 243; opposition to, 249; attendance on official duties, 250; letter to people of New London, 252, 253; his will, 253; where he lived, 254-259; his family, 260; died, 261; encomiums, 262-264.
 Seats assigned in Church, 198.
 Services between Blinman and Bulkeley, 93.
 Shepard, Rev. Thomas, 49.
 Smith, Dea. John, 208.
 Stanton, Thomas, 91, 139, 158, 160.
 Sturr, Dea. Cortland, 287; Dea. Geo. E., 290; Dea. W. H., 288; Rev. W. H., 314.
 Stoddardean plan, 172.
 Taxes burdensome, 248.
 Thanksgiving appointed, 141; omitted, 140.
 Thomson, 81.
 Thompson, Rev. William, 308.
 Tibbets, Dea. J. W., 287.
 Tinker, Rev. C. P., 317; John, 63, 93, 94, 292.
 Town, the parish, 94, 95.
 Trumbull Dr., 1, 15, 22, 36, 89, 113, 248; J. H., 107, 110.
 Unitarianism began, 171, 173.
 Warham, Rev. John, 10, 75.
 Wilcox, Dea. J. H., 290.
 Winslow, Edward, 1^o , 57, 58.
 Winthrop, John, Jr., secured charter, 9, 15; free spirit, 10, 12; ancestry, 14; first governor on soil of Conn., 15; letter about settling New England, 18; a Puritan, 19; his contemporaries, 20-25; letter to his son, 91; Davenport, writes to, 163.
 Winthrop, John, Sr., 17, 19.
 Yale College removed from Saybrook, 239, 242.
 York, Duke of, 110, 243.

